

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 455

HE 019 828

AUTHOR Purcell, L. Edward, Ed.; Beyle, Thad, L., Ed.
TITLE The Governors and Higher Education.
INSTITUTION National Governors' Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 52p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Council of State Governments, P.O. Box 11910, Lexington, KY 40578 (\$5.50).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120)
JOURNAL CIT State Government; v58 n2 Sum 1985

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Budgeting; Coordination; Educational Cooperation; Financial Support; *Governance; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; *Leadership Responsibility; *Political Influences; State Aid; *State Government
IDENTIFIERS *State Governors

ABSTRACT

The relationship between higher education and governors and state government is explored in eight articles. Brief introductions are provided by Samuel K. Gove of the University of Illinois and Governor Lamar Alexander, who served as a National Governors' Association chairman. An overview of the 1985 Wingspread Conference, which focused on the relationship of U.S. governors to their higher education systems, is also presented. Titles and authors of the articles are as follows: "The States and Higher Education: Changes Ahead" (Clark Kerr); "Governors in Higher Education: A Partnership for the Future?" (Terry Sanford); "The Changing Role of the Governor in Higher Education" (William Winter); "Former Governors Look at Higher Education: Crucial Issues Facing Academe" (Richard A. Zollinger); "The Governors State-of-the-State Addresses: A Focus on Higher Education" (Eric B. Herzik); "Governors and Higher Education: Politics, Budgeting, and Policy Leadership" (Madeleine Wing Adler, Frederick S. Lane); "State Coordination and Governance of Higher Education: Implications for Governors" (Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.); and "Dimension of Leadership in Higher Education" (Stanley O. Ikenberry). (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED284455

STATE GOVERNMENT

Volume 58, Number 2

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

Summer 1985

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
THE
GOVERNORS
AND
HIGHER EDUCATION
★ ★ ★ ★ ★

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Council of
State Governors*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



National Governors' Association



A Note to Authors

State Government publishes articles on all aspects of state government. Submissions are welcome from any source and will be judged by the quality and appropriateness of the thought, research and writing as evidenced by the manuscript. Articles on general topics, encompassing all or nearly all the states, or specific case studies that illustrate a subject of wide concern are most desired. Both theoretical and practical topics are welcome. All articles should be written in plain language with a broad audience of non-specialists in mind. Statistical analysis is welcome, but it must be clearly interpreted. If accepted, articles will be edited for style and content.

All submissions should be typed, double-spaced, on 8½" X 11" medium-weight paper, with at least a one-inch margin on all sides. A self-addressed, stamped envelope at least 9" X 12" should be included. Articles are usually eight to 12 typewritten pages, but longer articles will be considered. Submissions should be typed with about 25 lines (the equivalent of 250 words) per page. Original typescripts or letter-quality print-outs receive most favorable consideration. Authors are encouraged to submit pertinent tables, charts, illustrations, graphs or photos with their articles. Recent issues should be consulted for the proper formats. All notes must follow the form explained in *The Chicago Manual of Style* (13th ed.).

Direct all correspondence and submissions to: Executive Editor, *State Government*, The Council of State Governments, P.O. Box 11910, Lexington, Kentucky 40578.

The opinions expressed by authors are their own
and do not necessarily reflect opinions or policies
of The Council of State Governments.

State Government (USPS 520-040) is published quarterly by The Council of State Governments, P.O. Box 11910, Lexington, KY 40578. Annual subscription: \$20. Single copies: \$5.50. ISSN 0039-0097. Second-Class Postage Paid at Lexington, KY and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address change to *State Government*, The Council of State Governments, P.O. Box 11910, Lexington, KY 40578.

STATE GOVERNMENT

Published Quarterly

Volume 58, Number 2

Summer 1985

L. Edward Purcell, Editor
Thad L. Beyle, NGA Issue Editor

©Copyright 1985
The Council of State Governments
P.O. Box 11910
Lexington, Kentucky 40578

In This Issue

- Governors and Higher Education 42
Samuel K. Gove
- Wingspread Conference 43
- Introduction 44
Lamar Alexander
- The States and Higher Education: Changes Ahead 45
Clark Kerr
- Governors in Higher Education: A Partnership for the Future? 51
Terry Sanford
- The Changing Role of the Governor in Higher Education 56
William Winter
- Former Governors Look at Higher Education:
Crucial Issues Facing Academe 59
Richard A. Zollinger
- The Governors State-of-the-State Addresses:
A Focus on Higher Education 65
Eric B. Herzik
- Governors and Higher Education: Politics, Budgeting and
Policy Leadership 68
Madeleine Wing Adler and Frederick S. Lane
- State Coordination and Governance of Higher Education:
Implications for Governors 74
Aims C. McGuinness Jr.
- Dimension of Leadership in Higher Education 85
Stanley O. Ikenberry

Governors and Higher Education

Higher education systems, both private and public, have long had a special relationship to the states and to the governors that head them. University leaders historically have liked to think of their institutions as part of state government's fourth branch—autonomous, independent and free of gubernatorial involvement. In some states, higher education has been put on a pedestal, so to speak, by constitutional or statutory autonomy. And, everywhere there is that elusive something called "academic freedom," a concept that is unique to higher education and difficult to describe to those who are not connected with the academy.

At the same time, few institutions (save prisons perhaps) historically depend more on state dollars than those of higher education. For this reason, among others, most governors are actively involved in some aspect of higher education governance.

Despite a general recognition that the issue of how governors interact with higher education is important, "the role of the governor in higher education policymaking is [still] largely unexplored." Given the many serious problems facing higher education today, the time may have come when we must give serious attention to this issue.

Over the years the relationship between governors and higher education institutions has changed. Today, that relationship seems to be more positive than it was in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. This may be seen in the way governors handle important budgetary decisions, and how they make appointments to the coordinating and governing boards. On the other side of the coin, there seems to be an increasingly mature understanding in higher education circles that higher education is intimately involved in state politics, in the broadest sense of that term.

With the publication of the conference papers and speeches in this issue of *State Government* we hope to start a dialog on the relationship between the governor and higher education. The ideal relationship would be one in which there is trust on both sides. There is no model for this ideal, as indeed there should not be because the institutional arrangements vary tremendously from state to state. Undoubtedly this diversity will continue, just as our need for a clearer understanding of the variety of relationships will also continue.

Samuel K. Gove
University of Illinois

Wingspread Conference: Governors and Higher Education: A Partnership for the Future?

On March 24, 25 and 26, 1985, the Johnson Foundation hosted a conference at the Wingspread Conference Center near Racine, Wisconsin, on the relationship of the governors of the 50 states to the higher education systems within those states. Representatives of higher education, including heads of statewide systems, presidents of those systems, presidents of individual campuses, and representatives of national higher educational organizations met with former governors and others who have worked in governors' offices to explore the relationship. The Institute of Government and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois and The Governors' Center at Duke University jointly sponsored the three-day session, and a grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation is assisting in the publication of conference papers and presentations. The following represent the major observations flowing from the conference for those involved in this partnership.

(1) *Vital role of higher education.* Support for higher education is important to the present and future success of each of the 50 states. This is true for economic development reasons, as well as for enhancing the professions, expanding human opportunity, and improving the quality of life for all citizens.

(2) *Now is an era of the states.* A "federal era" in higher education of some 30 years is now concluding; the next 30 years belong to the states. This will require increased state support for institutions of higher education, and it will offer opportunities for new initiatives and accountability.

(3) *Key role for the governor.* No single individual in a state has a more significant role in this new situation than the governor. The relationship between the state's chief executive and institutions of higher education has generally improved over the past several years.

(4) *Forms of gubernatorial influence.* Governors influence higher education in many ways, ranging from excessive intrusion to benign neglect. Most take a middle road and become involved in such things as policy-making and budget allocations. How successful they are can depend on their degree of familiarity with and willingness to work with boards and chief institutional officers.

(5) *Importance of board appointments.* A unique strength of American higher education is its lay governance boards, and one of the most constructive ways in which governors can enhance both the quality and efficiency of higher education is through the people they appoint to such boards. In general, the record is good here.

(6) *Is higher education "political?"* As higher education has become more universal in attendance, more comprehensive in program, and more expensive to maintain, campuses have lost their "church status" and have now moved into the "marketplace of politics." With high-quality boards, statesmanlike governors, and understanding and cooperative legislatures, the term *politics* could come to mean using public power and public resources for the common good.

(7) *Need for higher education leadership.* Effective higher education leadership is needed now more than ever as expectations are rising, federal support is dropping, and demands on the tax dollar are increasing. Selection and review procedures for university chief executives can and must be improved.

(8) *Desire to cooperate.* To better serve the public, the leaders of the institutions of higher education must work more closely with governors, their important staff members, and other state officials concerned with higher and public education. Higher education administrators are increasingly eager to work with governors in all appropriate ways recognizing the need for better communication and cooperation. They are willing to be accountable if the accountability process in fact helps achieve goals mutually agreed upon.

(9) *Relations with the public schools.* Educating the citizens of each state is indeed "all one package," even though for administrative purposes it is divided into levels or sectors. Higher education leaders must be aware of the special needs of the K-12 state school systems and affirm their desire to work with them. At the same time, they have the vital role both in preparing and upgrading the teachers in the state systems. Those in higher education must evaluate how well they are performing this function.

Introduction

By Governor Lamar Alexander

A great many people in our society—especially parents, teachers, principals and students—are a lot more important than governors to our system of education in America.

The relationship between the teacher and the child is probably the most crucial. Parents—our first teachers—are fundamentally important, too.

But we governors do have a knack for helping set the education policy agenda in our states. Routinely the biggest share of our state budgets goes to education. Over the past three years, the unprecedented strides in education reform in the states have reminded us all of both the benefits of and the need for informed leadership in the state capitol.

That's why the National Governors' Association will be giving a great deal of its attention during 1985-86 to some of the most important education issues our states are likely to face over the next five years.

The *Governors' Report on U.S. Education 1991* will help governors focus and act on our states' most urgent need: better schools, colleges and universities.

The purpose of the report is not to prescribe any single policy or set of policies, but to help governors identify key issues and select reform strategies. This initiative will emphasize the most fundamental—and the most difficult—obstacles the states will have to consider and resolve. The project will include two stages.

The first stage will begin in August 1985, and continue for one year. It will start with a series of studies coordinated by the NGA but drawing on a multitude of resources across the country. These studies, under the direction of task forces of governors, will look at the handful of fundamental education issues. Each task force will meet with educational authorities several times during the year to consider the issue, examine research and explore possible solutions. By the end of the year, legislative options and supporting material will be gathered, published and distributed.

The second stage will begin in August 1986, and continue through 1991. The NGA will establish annual self-appraisal report cards on selected issues: 50 self-evaluations of progress toward excellence and equal opportunity in education.

Governors have much to offer each other. *The Governors' Report on U.S. Education 1991* will therefore build on each state's experience, wisdom and distinctive needs.

This initiative, while identifying key issues and providing unparalleled information resources, will recognize that each state must deal with these issues in its own way over the next five years.

Governor Alexander, currently vice chairman of the National Governors' Association, will become the new NGA Chairman in August.

The States and Higher Education: Changes Ahead

By Clark Kerr

My first point is that the great period of federal initiatives in higher education is clearly, totally ended. I define that period as roughly from 1955 to 1985; from Sputnik, which was technically in 1957, to appointment of a new Secretary of Education in 1985.

Recently, I was at a meeting listening to an extremely passionate address with the message that the "golden age" had ended and we are now entering a new dark age for higher education. This college president said that a new Henry VIII has been let loose on our land. He is out to destroy the monasteries, to disperse the priests over the landscape, to leave only the walls of the abbeys standing there holding their arms up to the skies as though pleading for salvation from heaven which will never come. He went on to say that this Henry VIII, as compared with the original Henry VIII, is a very ignorant man. He does not realize that the only two basic necessities of daily life for the modern college and university student are a hi-fi set and an automobile. Then he went on to talk about the academic world. He said, "I fear that the academic world is playing Hamlet, pacing around the castle in Elsinore, saying 'to be or not to be,' while this new Henry VIII is still at large." I sat there, thinking to myself and wondering whether it is a really good idea for a college president to read too much Shakespeare too late at night.

However, I do agree that an age has ended, although I do not think in quite such a dramatic way or with such drastic results. The end of the federal age has taken place, in part, because of the direct policies of the federal government, of the U.S. Secretary of Education, of the president of the United States, and with their new policies they are capping off the federal period. This would have happened anyway, I think, without these new policy decisions, because it would have

to be capped off as a result of other policies.

Given the budget deficits which we are running, it is highly unlikely that higher education, regardless of policy desires, would receive any new money. Beyond the current deficit and looking into the future, we are building up a huge federal debt which is going to take a very substantial portion of all of our federal revenues for a very long period of time to pay the interest, and possibly someday to pay it off. We are also building new weapon systems at tremendous costs and, regardless of what happens in Geneva and elsewhere, weapon systems in the United States are carried on to their ultimate conclusion in obsolescence regardless of their need. So more money for higher education would not be there even if new initiatives were.

The Federal Period

Contrary to my presidential friend, however, all is not being lost. The gains of the past 30 years will be (and should be) preserved, by and large, and they have been great. We have built up research activity in universities and colleges all over the nation such as the world has never seen, and this will continue. The student aid program, while almost certain to be revised to some extent, is also going to continue. It has a great deal of popular support. The affirmative action program, in one way or another, will also continue, and, in my judgment, the developments of this federal period in affirmative action are in the process of largely being won for women. Unfortunately, we have not made such a breakthrough with some of our minority groups; progress, but not a breakthrough. So, all will not be lost, but there are not

Clark Kerr is President Emeritus of the University of California, Berkeley.

going to be many more gains from federal initiatives for a long time ahead.

Let me say that I think that there are some advantages to be found in the end of the federal period of new initiatives, that the end of this period may be desirable, that perhaps it went about as far as it should go. There were some dangers in the federal period. I think we faced one in the late sixties when there was an effort by organized higher education—all of it—to get lump-sum grants from the federal government sent as a single check to institutions as such. Every organized group in higher education in the United States endorsed, in principle, proposals which would bring about this approach. The temptation was great. The federal government then had billions of dollars, and there was a president who wanted to call himself the “education president.” He said that he was going to make more money available for education than had ever been made available in American history. There were going to be new initiatives, and more could be done than ever before. Seeing all that money and that sympathy by the president and by Congress, there was this feeling that the time had come to make a great step forward in the form of lump-sum grants.

Our Carnegie Commission¹ opposed this particular step, and we were accused, on various occasions, of treason to higher education. We were the one group tied into higher education that did not support the common position, and were accused of stabbing higher education in the back. All the members of our commission were put under extraordinary pressure because of the position we took. We had eight meetings on this subject and decided unanimously that for the federal involvement to go the lump-sum way would be a very grave mistake.

Here are some of the reasons that made us stand against everybody else:

(1) We were afraid that if the federal government started giving lump-sum grants to our institutions of higher education, the states would withdraw and it would become a federal system before very long.

(2) We were afraid that we would lose some of the great diversity of higher education represented by state concern and state initiative, and would lose the competition which had advanced

American higher education as one state tried to catch up with another. In those days New York and Texas were trying very hard to catch up with California.

(3) We were concerned that, with public and private institutions both getting their basic money from the federal government, they would, over time, be more homogenized.

(4) We were concerned about the controls that might follow the money and that there would be one set of controls over everybody.

(5) We were concerned with how the federal government would select institutions for support and what it would do to them in the process. Which institutions with religious affiliations would it accept, and what would it force religiously oriented institutions to do to get those lump-sum grants?

(6) We also did not have full faith in the constancy of the federal government. Not because the federal government is evil but because the federal government has many more important things to do than to watch out for higher education. It has to monitor prosperity, inflation and depression. To what extent would federal policy toward higher education simply reflect what the federal government had to do to overcome depression or stop inflation? The federal government also has to be concerned with peace and war and all those stages in between. Might there be circumstances when the federal government would place its concerns for peace and war over the maintenance of the system of higher education? The states have historically been very constant in their support of higher education and do not have these necessary diversions drawing their attention elsewhere.

(7) We also wondered, when the crunch came as it might under some circumstances, how well 3,000 institutions could stand up against the budget cutters. What political influence would 3,000 institutions have in maintaining their lump-sum payments as compared to our Carnegie alternative which was giving the money directly to the students and thus building a constituency of millions of parents and potential parents?

(8) We also thought the agreed-upon proposal by higher education was regressive. Giving lump-sum payments to the institutions as they stood would have resulted in a very heavy subsidy for

the higher income groups of the nation since such a high proportion of college students come from families in the upper income brackets. What the nation needed more, we thought, was a subsidy for young people from less advantaged families, not the most advantaged.

(9) We also had another concern: would Congress pass this proposal when it started to realize the huge potential commitment it would be taking on as lump-sum grants drove out other sources of support both state and private?

So, against all of the wishes of organized higher education, we came out with another proposal which was sponsored by both Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. It passed and gave rise to what are now called Pell Grants. The decision to go that way, placing funds in the hands of millions of students rather than directly in the financial coffers of 3,000 institutions, was, I think, the major federal decision made since the founding of the land-grant system in 1862. We saw, against the wisdom of the time, that there were perils in the federal period as well as results to be obtained.

Later, the Carnegie Council came out against the idea of a federal Department of Education.² We were concerned as to who would run that department, who would have the real influence there. Would it represent higher education really well since so much of the interest of higher education is really in the fields of medicine, research, etc.? We also wondered how effective a small department would be, the smallest in the federal government. We came up with alternatives, one of which was a Department of Health, Education and Science. I still think that was a better alternative.

The New State Period

My second point is that we are once again entering a state period in higher education. This has been the standard situation for higher education since the founding of our republic, except for the land-grant period from 1860 to 1890 and the recent period from 1955 to 1985. The states, by and large, have taken good care of higher education; otherwise we would not have the best system of higher education in the world. Perhaps I should

say that we are entering a state-private period of higher education when, once again, the major initiatives will come from state and private sources.

The states, in fact, may do better than they have ever done before in supporting higher education as higher education becomes more important to interstate competition. With all the concern about jobs and economic development, the states are becoming even more competitive in advancing their higher education systems since one of the greatest assets a state can have in the competition with other states and with foreign nations is its system of higher education.

Also, the states may be even more interested in and do better by higher education than they have historically for another reason. There is more pressure from parents to get a good education for their children because of what it means to their lives, what it means to their incomes. This pressure rises, in part, because more and more of the potential students come out of households where their parents and even grandparents have had a college education and know what it has meant to their lives.

So I rather welcome, under the conditions of these times, the return to state initiatives and to the states as the principal source of new money.

Governors and the New State Period

My third comment is that, within most states, the governor has now become the most important single person in higher education. This is different than it was in 1955 when the recent federal period began. Then the governor in hardly any state would have been said to be the most important person in higher education. Now we go into a new state period with the governor in a more crucial position than ever before.

Before 1955, while some governors and legislators may have been very much involved in patronage, they were less interested in policy and they were generally more reticent about getting into policy whether interested or not than they are today. Now it would be almost inconceivable that, over this 30-year period, governors would not have become more concerned with policy. Higher education enrollments tripled in the

1960s. Over the 1960s and 1970s, they quadrupled, and the sums of money in state budgets going into higher education have gone up enormously. That has to bring the governors into policy, even if they are totally out of patronage as California has been for a very long period of time.

Further, there is a lot more public interest in what happens within higher education. Parents want more places and better places for their children. Higher education, additionally, is more important to the economy of the states. And higher education, over that period of 30 years, has taken over much of the cultural life of the nation. The great mass of the American people now get their cultural opportunities through our 3,000 campuses. That makes it more important for the governors too. And more of the entertainment life of the nation, for good or ill, comes through some of our large universities that are heavily active in sports.

Governors also have mechanisms they did not have in 1955. They have bigger staffs and they have better staffs. There has also been the development of state coordinating mechanisms that permit governors to become involved, not campus by campus, which would frequently be impossible, but through coordination where it is possible to have an impact.

I think the student revolts of the 1960s were terribly important. They brought the governors into campus life as almost never before, under public pressure or by their own desire or by both. There began to be a kind of intervention we had never seen before. I think that the autonomy, the independence of the university, has been something like the autonomy of the church. To a large extent, higher education comes out of the churches and was long protected by the idea of the separation of church and state. We lost our church status in the late 1960s. We are now in the marketplace of politics, and we are no longer looked upon as an institution apart. I think that was a very important development.

So the governors, as we go into this new state period, are the most important people in higher education across almost all of the nation. There are some dangers in this, I think, as the governors can become too important. In the recent

AGB study I directed, members of our group talked with 800 people in all 50 states.³ I was impressed in talking with heads of consolidated systems, coordinating councils, and big land-grant universities how important, almost overwhelmingly important, the governor has become to these people.

Several told me that not just the most important person in their professional lives but the *only* important person in their professional lives was the governor. If they got along with the governor, the board was going to support them and the faculty was going to support them. If they did everything else right, and did not get along with the governor, they were going to lose the support of their board and of their faculty. And so I believe that governors can become too important. The heads of systems, the heads of coordinating mechanisms, the heads of big campuses can become too tied to one single individual. It runs against my own feeling for pluralism and, I think, the standard American feeling of the importance of pluralism—separation of power.

The danger is not when there is a supportive and understanding governor, but governors vary in the intensity of their interests and also in the direction of their interests. Some are for and some against higher education. I wonder whether, as we go into this new state period, we may not have too few checks and balances and too few filters against the power of an unfriendly governor.

I think also there are other dangers in this new state period. Revenue sharing has almost come to an end. That is going to squeeze the states, some more than others, and that is going to squeeze higher education. The states may not be able to do as well as they would like. Likewise, we are almost bound to have some difficult economic times ahead which will affect the states as well as the federal government. It is almost impossible to think that we could have this enormous gap between our revenues and expenditures at the federal level, this enormous gap between what the dollar is really worth and what it is now getting on the international money markets, this enormous gap between what we buy abroad and what we sell abroad, this enormous gap between what some countries around the world can afford to repay on their debts to

us and what their debts really are, this enormous gap between the savings of the United States and the amount of money we are investing based on the savings of the whole world (and we will have to pay these new debts back), and this enormous gap between the very slowly increasing rate of productivity in the United States as compared with that of other industrial nations without having some difficulty for the states and for higher education.

Issues in the New State Period

My fourth point is that, if the governors are the most important education officers in their states now, and for higher education too, there are some very grave issues ahead for them to decide. There is a great deal at stake:

(1) There is a contest in so many states between the public and the private institutions, almost open warfare in some places around this country. What are the governors going to do about it?

(2) It seems to me that there is a coming conflict in the states between what they will want to do for the more elite and the less elite institutions. To draw in industry, states will want to put more emphasis upon the more elite institutions with their research facilities and their ability to train people with the highest skills. In the 1960s, the emphasis was on the community colleges. Now what are the governors going to do as between the elite and the less elite academic institutions?

(3) What funding formulas are they going to establish? Enrollment-driven formulas worked very well in a period of expansion, but when enrollment declines, what were once variable costs under expansion suddenly become fixed costs.

(4) Unionization is another major issue. The number of faculty in unions has been steady for a long period of time, but as faculties get threatened and tenured people start being let go, unionization could increase again. What position are governors going to take on negotiations, because increasingly the negotiations are going to take place at the level of the state government. The tendency, always in the trade union movement, is to go where the money is, and the governor has it. How are they going to handle unionization?

(5) How are they going to react to shifts in the labor market? To what extent are they going to

put more pressure on colleges and universities to strengthen technology as compared with the humanities and the social sciences?

(6) Teacher education is in trouble every where, too. What are the governors going to do?

(7) Affirmative action, I think, is going to move more and more from the federal level to the state level. And what about the situation of minorities? There are no riots in the streets right now, but there have been in the past, and there could be again. There are unsettled problems in this nation, real tensions.

So the governor as chief academic officer has some very, very difficult problems to solve.

Leadership Is Needed

My fifth point is that we are going to need better leadership at all levels of higher education—at the level of the governors and their staff, at the level of boards of trustees, at the level of coordinating agencies, which were not so important in more static periods but are very important in periods of growth and even more important in times of decline. We need better leadership, or chances for leadership, at the campus level and at the system level—a better chance for leadership across the board and in a balanced way. To balance the greater strength of the governor, we need to give greater strength to boards and to presidents, to ensure effective pluralism. Our AGB study on presidential leadership in higher education was initiated not by presidents but by trustees who were concerned with what they thought was a weakening of leadership. They were concerned that it was getting harder for them to persuade highly qualified people to become presidents. They thought the turnover was too rapid. They were very concerned that their presidents did not seem to be preparing their institutions for the future. We found all of their perceptions to be true. There are more managerial leaders now and there are more who simply try to survive, not lead. We made a great many suggestions about how the presidency might be strengthened.

Along with the greater importance of the governor and the desirability of having better governors and better staff for governors, I think we ought to be concerned with strengthening leadership clear across the board, partly because the

problems are so difficult and partly also because we want to get some balance. It has been an absolutely fundamental American belief that not too much power should ever be placed in the hands of any one individual. That means creating countervailing centers of power. Our founding fathers not only provided for countervailing power but also provided protection for some basic rights. I think in higher education we need to be concerned with establishing some of our rights more definitely than we have to ensure essential autonomy in the academic field.

My final word is this. I do not think, as my presidential friend did, that we are all a lot of Hamlets deciding whether "to be or not to be"; we all want "to be." But I have gotten the impression traveling around the country that, for reasons that I do not fully understand, higher education is in a more defensive mood than I think it ought to be. We have so much to be proud of. We have individual failures, but a lot about which to be proud. I think that some of the reports that we are now making about ourselves are critical beyond any reasonable level. I think that we have a very great story to tell. We have made very great contributions to this nation. We can make even greater ones in the future. And if we are not as good in the year 2000 or the year 2015 as we are now, part of this is going to be our own fault. We are going too far in the direction of this defensive, apologetic mood and not standing up in an aggressive way and fighting for ourselves in the ways in which I think we should, given the support we generally have from the people in the United States. I feel fully confident that this nation can have an even better system of higher education. And we are certainly going to need it for the sake of this nation in our increasingly competitive position in the world.

Notes

1. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Quality and Equality: New Levels for Federal Responsibility for Higher Education* (New York: McGraw Hill 1968).
2. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *Federal Reorganization: Education and Scholarship* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1977).
3. Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership, *Presidents Make a Difference: Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984).

Governors in Higher Education: A Partnership for the Future?

By Terry Sanford

The first thing that occurs to me about the question of a partnership between governors and higher education is that higher education, state by state, surely needs the governor as a partner. The next question might be, why does a governor want higher education as a partner? Most governors already have too many petitioners eager to be partners. It seems to me that governors need education as a partner because the governor cannot do his job without education, and certainly higher education, as a fundamental part of his programs. I am not sure how we get that message across to governors, but I am satisfied that it has been getting across more and more, year by year.

More and more governors have come to see what an important role higher education plays in their own aspirations. I think it goes back to the proposition that state government should have, as its first concern, looking at all the other things we might have done historically, the broadening of opportunities for all its citizens. If governors reach that conclusion, then they must conclude also that that goal is best achieved through education. There are a variety of other activities that enhance economic well-being, but personal opportunities, the provision for which is the role of the state, are most likely created through education, and higher education has a special role to play.

The governor who cares about the future of his state, who is dedicated to serving his people, who worries about their opportunities in life, and who sees his job as the leader of the state to point out the paths to the best human fulfillment, does, indeed, come back to education as the means of making lives more worthwhile. I have observed now over the years that the best governors have always been those governors who understood the role of education, who did something about edu-

cation, who believed in education, and who were willing to invest in education as the best purpose of democratic government. The governor who is a champion of education has always, invariably, state by state and time after time, been judged to be a great governor, so a conscientious governor cannot be oblivious to higher education. And I conclude that the governor needs that partner.

Education in a state, especially higher education, must have the support of the governor, from the point of view of the educator. The governor is the only one who can rally the support to reach the goals of higher education; the only one who can assure adequate funding; and the only one, I might add, who can knock heads on behalf of the taxpayers when the various factions of education begin to feud among themselves—when they have wasted money or when they get carried away by false pride and institutional ambitions beyond their appropriate missions. All state institutions cannot and should not be research universities. Most of all, the institutions need the positive and creative support of the governor, and this includes all of education beyond the high school—the state's colleges and universities, its junior colleges and technical colleges, and its private colleges, all of higher education. All of these institutions contribute to the hopes and dreams of the people of the state, and all are important to the personal and economic well-being of the citizens of the state.

As a new governor looks at all of his problems and his opportunities as he takes office and decides, as surely he must, that higher education is one of his principal concerns, what is it that he should do? Having put his priorities straight, knowing that higher education is crucial, not just

Terry Sanford is President of Duke University and former Governor of North Carolina.

important, he needs to define his own official and specific goals that he wants to accomplish through higher education. Does the governor want the state's higher education to be good, to be the best, to be comprehensive, to be selective, to excel in research, to open its doors to all who will come, or all of those things?

I think the new governor needs to ask at least four questions: Is the state supporting its higher education adequately, and if not, what needs to be done? Is the governor who can increase budgets. Is the institution focusing its expenses, that is, not wasting money on unnecessary things? Is the system, all institutions beyond the high school, reaching all of the young people with opportunities suitable to their own needs and abilities? And then, a tougher or more touchy question: Is the educational mission of each and every institution being achieved? This latter question is touchy because it could mean political interference, and surely that is not intended. He need not, indeed must not, for example, attempt to dictate curriculum, but he must know the answer to this question. It relates to the first question. Surely not many are likely to emulate Huey Long, who specifically appropriated money for the marching band, designed their uniforms, and sat on the bench with the football squad during football games. Even the institution's president doesn't do that.

There is a line between what the supporters of higher education and the professionals in higher education should do. There is a line between what a board of governors or trustees should do, and what should be left to the administration. Certainly there is a line between what the governor, who frequently is the appointing authority of boards, should do in relation to both boards and administrators. The governor needs to assure himself that the appropriate professional people are making appropriate educational evaluations, that proper standards are being achieved, and that the goals are as high as they ought to be. There are ways that the governor can test the standards, the level of achievement, and the excellence of an institution without interfering or personally making those evaluations. The governor must never see himself as the professional educator; that is not his task, even if he happened to be so qualified.

A state's people are fortunate if their governor already knows much about higher education and its place in the future of the state as he takes office. You can be sure that the first word the new governors will receive is that higher education is drastically in need of more financial support right now! This comes, of course, from the higher education administrators and the board members, and as best I can find there is no recorded incident of contrary advice having been given to a new governor. To determine whether or not there is adequate support, the governor certainly can determine whether or not faculty salaries are competitive, but other than that, assuming he knows the implications of the competition for faculty, adequate support is a complex question. He cannot come to his answers by instinct, in all likelihood. He cannot do it by personal examination and evaluation, if for no other reason than he does not have the time to pursue such an inquiry. And certainly, above all, he cannot take, without some supporting evidence, the simple assertion of the chief executive officer of the college or university, for there are constant internal pressures on the college executive for more and more program support, buildings and salary increases. The governor, to do his job, needs to seek outside supporting advice. It behooves the university president to make available those sources. It behooves the governor to take advantage of such sources, assuring himself that they are objective and impartial. Maybe the best thing that the governor can do is to prompt outside evaluations to answer all of the questions that he needs to raise; specifically, the four I have suggested are universal.

All these questions and others can be determined by the governor by evaluations from outside the system itself. Surely he wants evaluations from inside the system, but a wary governor will also get evaluations from outside the system, especially if he senses that additional financial support is indicated. There are various mechanisms, but it seems best for the governor to take the lead in devising these outside sources. I am not suggesting that the governor become adversarial. We don't need that. I am suggesting that he should have a supportive attitude, and that he can best support if he knows for sure what is needed and if he has the evidence from an impar-

tial source that this is needed. The governor needs to find out, quite beside the budget considerations, what the university administrators care about, and what they are trying to do for the young people of the state, for the state itself, for other citizens, and for the economic health of the state in the development of job capacities and artistic talents, research and scientific advancements, and recruiting and keeping good faculty for all of those purposes. The administrators are not just running another state institution and spending money. They are not bureaucrats, or should not be. They are giving their lives to efforts to improve and enrich the lives of the people of the state, and they are certainly carrying on missions, especially in the research universities, that not only serve the people of that state, but serve all of society. The governor needs to be caught up in these concerns and activities.

The governor needs to be in tune with the higher education administrators, not looking at education as the chief budget officer but looking at it as they do—as one who cares about the future of the people and the future of the state. The successes of the higher education administrators are to be the successes of the governor. The governor must understand, must be informed.

The governor, for one approach, can bring in one or two well-informed authorities on higher education in whom he has confidence, who have no axes to grind, and ask them to look at his institutions and give him an evaluation of their needs, their successes, their weaknesses, and their potential. They can help him answer the question: "What is it that I, as governor, need to do?" For this he can rely as well on a study commission, better if organized by himself, by the legislature, by a group of public citizens, or by private sources such as a foundation, rather than by the institution. Study commissions often make reports that gather dust, but also they have been extremely effective in answering questions about higher education that can guide the governor, especially if the governor has asked for and is waiting for the advice. The governor can also have a firm hand in being certain that the right questions are being asked, the questions to which he needs answers.

Whatever the mechanism used, it is wise for a governor to get an evaluation from the very

best possible sources available before determining precisely what it is that ought to be done to enhance higher education within his state. The governors who have been most successful in carrying out improvements in higher education have been those who have learned from impartial sources just what ought to be done.

The governor, once knowing what he needs to do, is generally the person in the best position to mobilize the kind of legislative and public support that will help the universities and colleges best serve their respective missions. There will be many who feel that higher education should be removed, if not remote, from the sphere of the governor. I take the other view. I trust governors, generally. The governor is the spokesman for the hopes and aspirations of any state, and he is in the best position to mobilize public support, especially when new expenditures are indicated.

All institutions of higher education need a frequent evaluation. I would say they need almost continuing review and evaluation. A new governor, prompting that kind of review and evaluation, positions himself to be an effective partner in higher education.

As the governor seeks all of this advice by whatever means, it most likely will be determined that financial support is inadequate because most states have not measured up to adequate support for higher education. And if it is judged to be inadequate by his experts and commissions and advisors and whatever sources he calls on, the next questions are: "Where inadequate? How inadequate?" It may very well be that the support is not only inadequate, but also that tremendous sums of money are wasted, or at least are misdirected. For example, some institutions are heedless in their growth. This is brought about by two or three influences. One influence is a matter of false pride—the desire to be the biggest, with no particular heed for being the best. Another cause might be called structural, because so many states provide support on the basis of full-time equivalent students, so that it is incumbent upon the school that would have the money for whatever other activities it might want to pursue, such as research graduate programs, to promote the largest possible undergraduate enrollment, which is the FTE that most legislatures look at in setting appropriations. I

have always thought that this was a very unsound system. Not only does it bring about heedless growth, but it brings about the necessary corollaries—the reduction of standards, the loss of direction, and the forgetting of mission—simply to have more students for more full-time equivalent units for more institutional dollars and sometimes for more institutional vanity, neglecting all of the time if not ignoring the fundamental and central purpose of the institution. It is also possible for an institution in its vanity, or the faculty's vanity, to forget the mission of the institution in trying to be measured by some vague imagined image that they would like to have nationwide or to have as they go around to their faculty meetings, instead of sticking to an already proven and sound mission for their particular institution.

I have been looking for a governor to find a better way for measuring state support, one that does not reward unjustified expansion. Certainly bigger in higher education is not necessarily better. The governor should ponder this question, because it may very well be that no one but the governor can call a halt to unwarranted growth. No one but the governor, in all probability, can spread the growth out to several state institutions by insisting that separate standards be set to maintain the integrity of state purpose of each individual institution. Some must have higher standards, if the state is to be well-served, and others quite appropriately should have lesser standards in order to open the opportunities of higher education to young people who cannot or have not achieved quite so well. There is too much of a hodgepodge in most systems. California has attempted to develop a rational plan, with students of a certain demonstrated capacity going to some of the institutions, and those with a less demonstrated capacity having a choice of other institutions, but with the chance always of those demonstrating a greater potential than originally shown having the opportunity to move on to the more selective institutions. Most states have not exercised this kind of discipline, greatly to the detriment of the standards of their institutions and the economical use of their funds.

There are so many ways that only the governor, with his prestige and power and leadership,

can assure the very best uses of higher education within his own state. The governor's responsibility for state colleges and universities is obvious, at least to me. They are state instrumentalities, but they are more because they are the hope of an educated people, so the governor is the responsible spokesman, the responsible officer, and the most powerful single influence, and the best hope for success of any state institution—that is, the best hope of assuring that the aspirations of the administrative leadership can succeed. The governor has the same kind of responsibility and relationship to the state-supported junior or technical institutions by whatever name. The sorting out and clearly defining of their various duties and responsibilities, and insisting that they remember that young people, not institution-building, are their charge, can be achieved only by the governor.

It may be less obvious that the governor also is responsible for maintaining the dual system of higher education. The dual system of higher education is unique in its contribution to the system of higher education in America. Ours is not a uniform, monolithic system as found in so many other countries around the world. Our system of education is competitive, vibrant, many-faceted, and is not shackled by the kind of uniformity that is found even in the mother country of England, where the controlling hand of government, it can be argued, has stifled the true potential of higher education. Too much there is dependent on the government, its whims, its prosperity, and its political leanings of the moment. It was noted recently in *The Economist* that "higher education as usual" may very well be England's ultimate undoing. The thought was that the private enterprise has been taken out, that national bureaucracy has overwhelmed the institutions, and that national budget cuts have severely damaged the stability of British universities.

Without belaboring the point, I will assert that the dual system of higher education, both public and private, has been the making of a great system of higher education for America. We have had the competitive forces, but we have also had the supporting forces. Frequently it was the private institution that could overcome the forces that would retard academic freedom and, on the

other hand, public institutions frequently carried forward with innovations that private schools could not afford. In any event, the combination has meant so much. Its uniqueness has distinguished it from all other systems around the world, and the dual system of higher education in America must be protected. It so happens that the best protector is the governor.

Private colleges are in trouble, not because they are inefficient, but because sound public policy of low tuition and the turn in economic events in America have disadvantaged them. By and large, higher education in America began with private institutions. Then came the state institutions gradually, and suddenly with the advent of the Morrill Act land grant colleges, state institutions sprang up all across the nation. They learned from the private schools, and the private schools learned from them. Finally both learned from one another, and higher education in America flourished.

Higher education still flourishes, but the private schools are in trouble because of that sound state public policy—low tuition at state institutions. Not too many years ago, the tuition differential between the public and the private colleges and universities was not so great. There was enough difference, and enough difference in size, to permit and encourage choice within a wide diversity, but cost was not a major factor in the students' decision as to whether to go to one kind of a college or another. Inflation, especially over the last 20 years, has changed that. As costs went up, state legislatures, as they should have done, in my opinion, picked up most of the cost of inflation, and rarely changed the tuition charges. Rich and poor alike can go to the state institution at very low tuition rates, and the taxpayers pick up the bill for all. I think this is a sound policy because it helps establish the proposition that any ambitious young person,

regardless of the availability of money, can go to college, can seek higher education. The difficulty with that sound public policy is that it created, as a side effect, quite inadvertently, a spread between the cost of private colleges and public colleges that has become threatening to the continuation of the dual system of higher education in America. The gap between tuition in public institutions and private institutions widened so that many students no longer had a choice, but simply had to go to the place that was cheapest. It is not reasonable to expect the state-supported higher education establishment to share eagerly tax funds with students who prefer a private college. I know that. It is very difficult to get the state establishment to campaign for funds for students who want to go to private colleges. Some states and their educators—particularly California, with Berkeley and Stanford working closely—look beyond their own turf and are champions of all of education in that state. That is the posture needed everywhere. I suggest that this is the governor's problem—to figure a way to preserve the invaluable structure of a dual system of higher education that has meant so much, without doing damage to public higher education. I have observed that only the governor has the position and power to protect and defend the dual system.

Higher education, public, surely needs the governor. Higher education, private, will die without the governor. The governor, if he is true to his trust, cannot succeed without giving attention to higher education, making all of higher education his partner in the service of the people of his state.

Certainly the governor and higher education must be partners for the future hopes of the people of the governor's state, and for the fulfillment of the governor's service as the leader of the state.

The Changing Role of the Governor in Higher Education

By William Winter

When I became governor of Mississippi in January 1980, I prided myself in having a special interest in and understanding of the problems of higher education in my state. After all I held two degrees from the University of Mississippi, had just served as president of the alumni association of that institution, and had been active through the years since my graduation in supporting its programs and activities. Moreover I had spent some 20 years on the board of trustees of Belhaven College in Jackson and 10 years on the board of another private institution of higher learning outside the state. I knew personally all of the state university and junior college presidents in Mississippi and had a good, friendly, personal relationship with all of them. Advancing the cause of higher education was among the top items on my agenda, and I felt that when I talked about it as a candidate for governor, I was not merely doing so out of a sense of political obligation.

Now that my tenure has ended after four years, governors of Mississippi being unable to succeed themselves, I look back and find to my dismay that despite my good intentions toward higher education, I spent considerably more of my time on a number of other issues in which I had far less personal interest or concern. For example, circumstances being what they were, I wound up devoting more hours to the problems of the state penitentiary than I did to all of the institutions of higher learning combined. This is illustrative of the thicket that many of us who have served as governors get trapped in. Regardless of our best intentions we find ourselves living by agendas that have been set for us so much of the time by unplanned and unexpected events. The complexities of governing now being so great, we too often succumb to crisis management, responding to demands and problems of seeming impossible

urgency at the moment but which now in retrospect appear relatively less significant. In other words, we fall into the trap of letting someone else decide what is important.

This tendency of some of us governors to be diverted by squeaking wheels has a special implication for higher education. In my state the basic responsibility for the governance of the universities is in the hands of a highly-regarded and semi-autonomous constitutional board of trustees with staggered 12-year terms. Governors come and go every four years, but this board has a continuity that enables it to address issues on what is properly a politically independent and long-range basis. Given the history of disastrous gubernatorial interference in the internal affairs of some of our universities in the past, this is an appropriate and even necessary protection for the academic integrity of those institutions.

At the same time this structure, which has its similar counterparts in most other states, tends to create a certain deference on the part of most governors toward involvement in higher education. For the normal governor who already has more to see about than he can possibly get around to, there understandably develops what can only be described as an attitude of "letting well enough alone." This is particularly so if there is the added concern that too much display of interest in higher education on his part might be construed as political interference by some folks, especially those with long memories of past gubernatorial fiascoes.

At the same time, on the other side of the fence, I have detected that there is a complementary understanding on the part of university presi-

William Winter was Governor of Mississippi from 1980 until 1984.

dents and their academic colleagues that recognizes that governors are, indeed, busy people who have to respond to even more constituencies than they themselves do. Unusually sensitive to that fact because of their own busy schedules, the advocates of higher education seem frequently reluctant to go directly to the governor's office except in the most urgent matters.

Thus, we find from both sides the development of an unfortunate tendency to minimize the process of direct communication. This is exactly the opposite of what we ought to be doing. Out of my own experience I insist that governors and leaders of higher education need to spend more time talking to each other and purposefully create initiatives that will bring them closer together. It is not enough to rely on chance meetings in capitol corridors or in crowded aisles at homecoming football games.

Because now more than ever before, higher education is involved in so many aspects of our lives, there ought to be an increased freedom of movement between the institutions and the governor's office. For instance, economic development is high on every governor's list of priorities. No longer, though, is this a process that relates only to the designated agency charged primarily with that responsibility. Every university worth its salt now has resources that are indispensable to this facet of a governor's needs. The management of a state's natural and human resources as well as the management of state government itself is now properly within the scope of the services which most institutions of higher learning have the capacity to offer. It is frequently only at the gubernatorial level, however, that the full range of these contributions can be adequately assimilated and the interagency conflicts resolved so as to achieve the most desirable results for the state as a whole.

This commitment to a closer, more comfortable and freer relationship between the governor's office and the halls of academia must not be permitted to arouse the old political ghosts of the past. With some understanding of the unhappy experiences resulting from heavy-handed gubernatorial politics, not just in Mississippi but also at one time in one form or another in many other states, I recognize the fragile but essential nature of academic independence. In some ways, though,

I believe that the developing of closer personal and official relationships between governors and university officials can serve to strengthen the prospects for academic integrity rather than weaken them. The governor after all is the state's chief executive. Even in a traditionally "weak governor" state like my own, the governor has a considerable power in his ability to mobilize and direct public opinion. He is much more likely to mobilize that opinion favorably to higher education if it is based on a close working relationship with the leaders of the institutions of higher learning.

I see the most vital role of the governor in this context as that of advocate. He should be regarded as an intervenor on behalf of higher education as distinguished from an intruder. As a matter of fact, he may be the only official with the capacity or the stature to resolve the petty conflicts that overzealous alumni and interest groups create based on a "rah rah" perception of higher education. It is my observation that some excessively aggressive so-called booster organizations produce more problems for university administrators than most governors ever have. Some such clubs are in the process of setting up political action committees, the exact purposes of which are not clear but which can lead to as much mischief as the more widely publicized recruiting abuses in the field of intercollegiate athletics. University heads and governors need to join hands in the discouraging of this unfortunate kind of misguided political activity.

The truth is that, whether we like it or not, public universities and governors alike exist in a political environment. It is no longer possible for a university head to pretend that he is above the political battle. The task now is to make the political process work for rather than against the interest of the university or the system of universities. That can be effectively done only by enlisting the active involvement of the one individual who stands at the top of the political establishment—the governor.

When I first entered politics in Mississippi as a member of the legislature almost 40 years ago, a very small percentage of the citizens of the state were alumni of the various institutions of higher learning. Not being conversant with the true nature of higher education, many legislators

were suspicious of what went on behind the ivied walls. It was easy to make university presidents and professors whipping boys and scapegoats. As a legislator, I felt obliged on more than one occasion to rise in defense against the mindless attacks that would be made by some of my legislative colleagues against able and respected academic leaders. Now most legislators and most other adults under 40 are the products of our colleges and universities. They will rally behind a governor who goes to bat for higher education.

That support has to be based, though, on an understanding in practical terms of educational

needs and goals. Proposals that are viewed as too esoteric or visionary cause legislative eyes to glaze over. This is where the hard-headed political direction of a governor who knows the process can make the difference. Governors and academic leaders need not only to be talking to each other more, but they must be talking the same language. Together they can forge an alliance that will serve well the public interest. That is not only good politics, it is good sense. And, after all, the promotion of that is what higher education is supposed to be about.

Former Governors Look at Higher Education: Crucial Issues Facing Academe

By Richard A. Zollinger

American governors have for some time now actively sought to increase the amount of attention and resources given to education in the belief that a better educated citizenry will bolster the economy and expand job opportunities. In the next several years gubernatorial activism, in the words of former Governor James B. Hunt Jr. of North Carolina, will be "sweeping and unprecedented" and will encourage "Americans to understand and commit themselves to education."¹

Governors have a special role to play in shaping a state's higher education programs and policies because they are responsible for the actions—the successes as well as the failures—of its public units, just as they are responsible for other state agencies. Gubernatorial stewardship of public higher education is so pervasive, both explicitly and implicitly, that "even if the problems facing colleges and universities could be left in the hands of governing boards and administrators, the problems are so pressing and the financial demands . . . so great, that state executives cannot avoid direct confrontation."²

A 1984 survey of 70 former governors from 40 states showed that funding of institutional operating expenses was viewed as the single most crucial issue facing higher education in the next 12 months and the next five to 10 years.³ Former governors also ranked competitive faculty salaries, student instruction costs and capital expenditures as high priority issues facing higher education in the future (see Table 1).⁴ There was very little variation in these responses by either party affiliation or region.

Gubernatorial concern with higher education operating and capital support signals a need for a "blue ribbon" reassessment of alternatives for

state institutional support. Such an assessment should place a premium on institutional mission, scope and program quality. Program quality will become increasingly important as campus dollars are steadily drained from the social sciences and humanities into the high-demand technology disciplines and programs. State postsecondary education leaders, particularly coordinating and governing boards and institutional presidents, must sustain a wide-ranging dialogue with both the governor and the legislature regarding national and state needs which affect academic program quality.

Time Spent on Higher Education Issues

Governors are constantly bombarded by a variety of issues that demand their time. In the survey, former governors were asked to estimate how much time they had spent on higher education issues. Thirty-six of the 68 governors responding to the question (53 percent) indicated they had spent more than 10 percent of their time on these issues (see Table 2). Democratic governors were more likely to have spent over 10 percent of their time on higher education issues (63 percent) than did their Republican counterparts (40 percent). Why such partisan differences occurred is not clear.

Similarly, the geographic region of the gubernatorial respondent had a slight relationship to the time spent on higher education issues. A sizable majority (58 percent) of former Southern governors devoted less than 10 percent of their time

Richard A. Zollinger is Director of the Illinois Resource Network and Adjunct Assistant Professor at the Institute of Government and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois.

Table 1
Ranking of Crucial Issues Facing Higher Education
by Former Governors

Issue	Next 12 months	Next 5-10 years
Funding Operating Expenses	1	1
Quality Instruction	2	4
Competitive Faculty Salaries	3	5
Consolidation/Cooperation of Instructional Programs	4	2
Student Instruction Costs	5	9
Declining Enrollment	6	10
Administrative Management and Reorganization	7	NC
Role in State's Economic Development	8	2
Funding Capital Expenditures	9	8
State Role Toward Private H.E.	10	6
Research Capability of H.E.	NC	7

Key:
NC—Not cited.

Note: The issues listed here were the ones most frequently cited by respondents; 27 additional short-term and 33 additional long-term issues were also mentioned.

Survey Question: "What do you view as the crucial issues facing higher education in your state? Next 12 months? Next 5-10 years?"

to these issues, while a majority of former governors in each of the other three regions gave more than 10 percent of their time to them.

In sum, Table 2 illustrates that many former governors remembered spending considerable time on higher education, although there was variation by the party affiliation and region of the responding governor. This is contrary to the popular notion that colleges and universities have been generally ignored by past state executives. It supports the conclusion that colleges and universities (which use a sizable chunk of the state's tax dollars) are part of the complex and many decisions facing a governor.⁵

It is often suggested that higher education should be independent of politics or outside the regulations governing other state agencies. This view fails to recognize the political force attached to knowledge. Both Waldo⁶ and Wirt⁷ maintain that colleges and universities are themselves miniature political systems that offer knowledge, skills, status and certification to those who need them. Because not everyone can share these benefits, there is increasing competition over their distribution. In reality, post-secondary education provides but one means to distribute or redistribute societal wealth and power. As a result, the governor is called upon to spend in-

Table 2
Percent of Time Spent on Higher Education Issues
by Former Governors

	Less Than 10%		More Than 10%	
	No.	%	No.	%
Total Sample (68)^(a)	32	(47)	36	(53)
Political Party of Respondent				
Democrats (38)	14	(37)	24	(63)
Republicans (30)	18	(60)	12	(40)
Geographic Region of Respondent				
Northeast (13)	5	(38)	8	(62)
South (19)	11	(58)	8	(42)
Midwest (22)	10	(45)	12	(55)
West (14)	6	(43)	8	(57)

Note:
(a) Excludes two respondents who omitted this item.

Survey Question: "As governor, approximately what percent of time did you devote to higher education issues? a) 0-4%, b) 5-9%, c) 10-14%, d) 15-19%, e) over 20%."

creasing time on the allocation of public budget dollars among these institutional power centers and to establish priorities that influence their direction.

Issues That Warranted Gubernatorial Attention

What concerns caused the former governors to spend time on higher education? Former governors most frequently cited issues related to faculty salaries or university program expansion or contraction. Additional issues that required gubernatorial attention included new school creation (e.g., medical, law), private higher education, and competing aspirations among universities and colleges (e.g., expanded missions or programs). Former governors were least apt to be involved with athletics, collective bargaining, admissions and university research priorities (see Table 3).⁸

There were few variations by party or region; a notable exception was private higher education. The state's role in private higher education was the single most pressing issue for the Republicans but merited only a sixth-place ranking by Democratic governors. Private higher education and tuition required top priority among Northeastern governors in contrast to noticeably lower attention by Southern and Western governors.

Of the three higher education issues warranting the greatest amount of gubernatorial atten-

Table 3
Ranking of Specific Higher Education Issues Requiring Gubernatorial Attention

Issue	Overall rank	Political Party		Geographic Region			
		Democrats	Republicans	North-east	Midwest	South	West
Faculty Salaries	1	1	2	4	2	2	2
Institutional Contraction/Expansion	2	1	2	4	1	3	1
New School Creation	3	3	5	2	5	1	3
Private Higher Education	4	6	1	1	3	6	6
Tuition	5	4	2	2	3	6	4
Competitive University Aspirations	6	6	6	7	6	4	5
State H.E. Reorganization	7	5	8	4	9	5	8
Program Emphasis	8	8	10	8	9	10	8
Campus Unrest	9	10	9	8	7	12	10
Spiraling Instructional Costs	10	12	7	10	7	10	7
Research Priorities	11	9	11	10	12	8	15
Admissions	12	11	13	13	13	9	12
Faculty Workload	13	12	14	13	13	13	12
Controversial Speakers	14	14	11	13	15	13	10
Collective Bargaining	15	15	15	12	9	NR	12
Athletic Programs	16	16	16	16	15	15	15

Key:

NR—Insufficient citations to be ranked.

Note: Additional issues mentioned by governors included: development of new coordinating boards, integration, library facilities, merger, capital improvements, attracting new instructional personnel and legislative funding.

Survey Question: "As governor, what particular higher education issues demanded gubernatorial attention? Please list."

tion, one (faculty salaries) had a comparable counterpart in state government (i.e., state employee salaries); another (a new regional medical school or campus) challenged other political constituencies. Former governors generally stayed away from direct identification with campus or institution-specific issues (i.e., research priorities, admissions) unless the issue was juxtaposed with an accepted or recognizable state norm or practice. These governors were more apt to intervene directly on issues that were tied to recurring budget commitments. On the other hand, gubernatorial identification with a particular university program was often solicited by a president or chancellor who recognized that executive support was crucial for moving major institutional programs forward.⁹

Gubernatorial Views on Private Higher Education

Despite the attention given to private higher education, less than one-third (31 percent) of the former governors supported state aid for private university facilities, equipment and campus needs, with a sizable majority either opposed (56

percent) or not sure (13 percent). Of those former governors in favor of aid to private higher education, Democrats (35 percent) were more apt to favor these grants than were Republicans (11 percent).

Viewing these responses by the former governor's region of service, Southern (24 percent) and Midwestern governors (18 percent) were strongly opposed while governors from the Northeast and the West were evenly split (see Table 4). These findings follow several traditions. First is that of Southern and Midwestern states to support comprehensive systems of public higher education including land-grant research universities, teachers colleges, technical schools and community colleges. Second is the long tradition and lasting influence of private colleges in the Northeast in which governors might be expected to favor direct aid to such institutions.

In a related question, the former governors were asked whether the state should provide financial aid to resident students attending private higher education institutions (see Table 5). Using this funding vehicle, more than a majority (56 percent) of the governors agreed to such aid. The greatest gains in support were among Repub-

Table 4
Gubernatorial Opinion on Direct Aid for Private
Higher Education Facilities and Equipment

	Agree		Not Sure		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total Sample (70)	22	(31)	9	(13)	39	(56)
Governor's Political Party						
Democrats (40)	14	(35)	6	(15)	20	(50)
Republicans (30)	8	(27)	3	(10)	19	(63)
Governor's Geographic Region						
Northeast (13)	6	(46)	0	(0)	7	(54)
South (21)	5	(24)	2	(10)	14	(67)
Midwest (22)	4	(18)	6	(27)	12	(55)
West (14)	7	(50)	1	(7)	6	(43)

Survey Question: "The state should provide direct grant support to private higher education for facilities, equipment, etc."

lican former governors (from 28 percent to 62 percent), and governors from the South (from 29 percent to 57 percent) and the Midwest (from 38 percent to 48 percent). As might be expected from the regional tradition, Northeastern state governors were very strong in their agreement (70 percent to 15 percent).

Our results should alert independent college associations, private institution presidents and state scholarship commission directors to the wide diversity of opinion among governors toward public funding of private universities. Private colleges and universities will doubtless have to turn to the states for greater financial support if the proposed reduction in federal student financial aid contained in the 1986 Reagan budget is approved by Congress. And from these former governors' response, the most promising vehicle to do so appears to be direct aid to the students rather than the institutions.

Governors' Perceptions of Their Impact on Higher Education

Since the mid-1950s, governors have become increasingly involved in higher education and have readily identified themselves with pivotal issues affecting colleges and universities. The current study asked governors to cite an area in which they had had an impact on the state's higher education system. These issues provided an excellent trend of gubernatorial involvement in higher

Table 5
Gubernatorial Opinion on Direct Aid for Private
Higher Education Students

	Agree		Not Sure		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total Sample (69) ^(a)	39	(56)	8	(12)	22	(32)
Governor's Political Party						
Democrats (40)	21	(53)	5	(12)	14	(35)
Republicans (29) ^(a)	18	(62)	3	(10)	8	(28)
Governor's Geographic Region						
Northeast (13)	9	(70)	2	(15)	2	(15)
South (21)	12	(57)	3	(14)	6	(29)
Midwest (21) ^(a)	10	(48)	3	(14)	8	(38)
West (14)	7	(50)	1	(7)	6	(43)

Note:

(a) One former governor did not respond to this question.

Survey Question: "The state should provide direct aid to resident students attending private higher education institutions through financial aid."

education during the past 30 years (see Table 6).

The mid-1950s to mid-1960s marked the beginning of many states' investment in a comprehensive higher education delivery system including community and technical colleges. Community colleges grew in response to a number of factors including the influx of GIs and a diverse group of students previously excluded. While this period of higher education growth began during the Eisenhower years, it hit a pressure point with the launching of Sputnik in 1957. This event helped trigger a massive federal investment in public higher education. Federal interest in research and development helped to build public university classrooms and laboratories and expand engineering schools and science curricula. The "race to the moon" forced states to reassess their vision of post-secondary education. In the early 1960s, governors and legislatures called for "master plans" that defined a university's mission and the state's educational priorities.

Public higher education experienced a period of massive growth between 1965 and 1974. Especially affected were professional schools (medical, dental, veterinary and law) and urban and regional community and junior colleges. The period of 1965-74 also witnessed the expansion of public universities and community colleges in response to the burgeoning enrollment of "baby boom" or

Table 6
Former Governors Look at Impact on Higher Education System

Issue Categories	Pre-1965 (14 respondents)	1965-74 (32 respondents)	1975-84 (23 respondents)
Consolidation/ Reorganization		Designate state department of H.E. Restructure governance of public universities Establish coordinating council for H.E. Consolidate state H.E. system	Merge state system (4) Strengthen role of H.E. commission Reorganize H.E. into single board of regents
Programs	Develop engineering college Develop new medical school (3)	Develop medical schools (3) Build libraries Develop veterinary school	Develop veterinary school (2) Start university technology programs (2)
Finance	Pass board issue for H.E. funding appropriations (4) Hold line on appropriations		Emphasize need for capital construction funds Capital construction
Student Concerns	Double student enrollment		Equalize financial aid to students in private H.E. Financial aid for low-income students in private H.E.
System/University	Incorporate two universities into system Expand smaller universities Develop technical college Create branch university system Develop community college systems (3)	Expand state college system (4) Develop and expand community colleges (5) Develop state vocational colleges (3) Create two state liberal arts colleges	
Leadership	Reduce public involvement and controversial issues Increase faculty salaries Upgrade building, faculty and curriculum	Hold off intrusions of legislature into H.E. (4)	Bring private and public presidents together (2) Fire professor for leading student demonstration Regent appointments Establish justification for new programs and schools

Note:

Yearly categories indicate a 10-year period during which the governor served his last year. Parentheses indicate frequency of responses by governors if greater than one.

Survey Question: "As governor, can you cite one or two examples where you or your staff had an impact on the state's higher education system?"

post-World War II children.

The gubernatorial legacy for this period was massive construction and expansion. By the 1970s there was increasing fear that too many higher education institutions were offering the same programs. Every institution wanted unlimited degree programs and a smorgasbord of curricular offerings. Higher education began to require an ever larger share of a shrinking state budget pie, which was now beginning to feel the effects of post-Vietnam economic slump. Governors and legislatures found a way to maximize shrinking resources by consolidating and coordinating the states' massive public higher education systems. One outcome was the rapid emergence of higher education governing and coordinating boards or commissions to advise state officials.¹⁰

The last 10 years (1975-84) have been marked by a renewed commitment by governors to reorganize and consolidate the states' higher education systems. While limited capital construction has continued, governors and their agents (state budget offices, coordinating or governing boards) have required greater justification for new programs. Higher education has become a "red ink" issue where expenses rapidly exceed available general revenue funds. When the national economy took a nose dive in the late 1970s and early 1980s, governors again had to hold down spending and growth in public higher education. On the bright side, universities discovered a new area of endeavor: high technology. It is not yet clear how extensively universities will be involved in spawning state industrial initiatives with the private sector, but there is no doubt that

high-technology innovation and commercialization have prompted governors all over the country to become involved in this aspect of their public higher education institutions.

Conclusion

The survey of former governors supported the belief that governors play an important role in setting the tone and texture of statewide public higher education. Governors, by their very nature as political leaders of the state, assume a responsibility to advocate, to persuade and to cajole various higher education interests in a desired direction. They also have a powerful impact through the executive budget process.

Two issues that will likely draw governors even closer into the public higher education realm will be escalating institutional expenses and the call for quality instruction. Specifically, they will be concerned with faculty salaries, student instructional costs, and deteriorating physical plants and equipment. Strategic planning at the state level will involve not only resource allocation, but also a careful balancing between higher education's commitment to technological innovation and its continuing attention to the quality of undergraduate and graduate programs.

Former governors suggested that for the immediate future state executives will perceive their greatest impact in higher education through activities or programs that establish capital projects or set new horizons in economic development and technological areas. For this reason, colleges and universities that can find meaningful ways to enhance gubernatorial leadership through such endeavors will likely fare best at budget time.

The power of a governor to influence statewide higher education brings to mind the words of John Millett: "The future of higher education rests squarely upon the political relationship between higher education and the governor."¹¹ While this forecast is now 10 years old, its import still holds.

Notes

Acknowledgments: Thad L. Beyle, Professor of Political Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, provided invaluable assistance in questionnaire design, data collection and data preparation. Assistance with data analysis was also provided by Robert S. Dalton, Ph.D. candidate at the University of North Carolina. The author is solely responsible for any conclusions or implications suggested by this paper.

1. *The New York Times*, March 22, 1983.
2. John Lederle, "Governors and Higher Education," in *The American Governor in Behavioral Perspective*, eds. Thad Beyle and J. Oliver Williams (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 232-35.
3. In fall 1984, an 18-item questionnaire was sent to the 218 living former governors as identified by the National Governors' Association. Seventy questionnaires were returned; 40 from Democrats and 30 from Republicans.
4. See the analysis by Eric Herzik in this issue.
5. Leonard E. Goodall, *State Politics and Higher Education* (Dearborn: LMG Associates, 1976), 42.
6. Dwight Waldo, "The University in Relation to the Governmental-Political," *Public Administrative Review*, 33 (March/April 1970): 109.
7. Frederick Wirt, "Educational Politics and Policies," in *Politics in the American States, A Comparative Analysis*, eds. Herbert Jacobs and Kenneth Vines (New York: Little, Brown & Co., 1976), 340.
8. Lyman A. Glenny and Thomas K. Dalglish, *Public Universities, State Agencies and the Law: Constitutional Autonomy in Decline* (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1973), 65.
9. Gene A. Budig, *Governors and Higher Education* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1969).
10. Robert Berdahl, *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1971), 73-172.
11. John Millett, *Politics of Higher Education* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1974), 33.

The Governors' State-of-the-State Addresses: A Focus on Higher Education

By Eric B. Herzik

While the bulk of state funding and policy initiatives in education are directed toward the primary and secondary levels, gubernatorial influence is probably greatest in the area of higher education. As priorities shift and funds for higher education shrink at the federal level, new initiatives and money for colleges and universities will have to come from the states. For many public university leaders, the governor is thought to be the only person who possesses "the power to make decisions about higher education."¹

Governors are in a predominant position to affect higher education policy-making. While education, by its sheer impact on state finances, has always drawn attention, the scope of gubernatorial interest in higher education issues has increased markedly in recent years as higher education has become an asset governors can market in the growing competition among states for economic development projects. Thus, emerging trends of increased gubernatorial involvement should only expand for at least the next decade.

To demonstrate this increased gubernatorial interest and concern, we analyzed governors' messages and budget proposals to the state legislatures over the past decade. A content analysis was performed on gubernatorial state-of-the-state and budget addresses between 1976 and 1985 as summarized in *State Government News*.² As the analysis concerned higher education policy, the coding procedure used in the content analysis followed one primary rule: a content item had to be policy-oriented. That is, each issue had to be associated with a specific piece of legislation or proposed action. Excluded from the analysis, therefore, were general political appeals (i.e., "a crisis in education") and simple identification

symbols (i.e., "education is the key to our future").³

The increasing importance of higher education to governors is reflected by the data in Table 1. As can be seen, the number and scope of policy proposals regarding higher education has been increasing over the decade.

Naturally, governors generally support state university systems, but while powerful actors in the higher education policy process, their involvement in the actual delivery of higher education services is limited.

Instead, governors' efforts center on providing adequate levels of funding and administrative support. Proposals concerning faculty and students all involve funding, in contrast to calls for reform and increased competency for both teachers and students at the primary and secondary education levels. Governors appear to be reluctant to take the lead in calling for tuition and fee hikes; indeed calls for such increases are matched by calls for expanded college loan programs.

The link between higher education and state economies has been recognized by governors, particularly since 1981. In attempting to position their states as sites for microelectronic and other high-tech industries, governors are emphasizing the development of university research resources. This is most evident in the 14 different state proposals in 1983 aimed at high-tech university development, and with the 10 in the 1984 and 1985 messages. Proposals to establish formal links between colleges and the business community are perhaps further evidence of this hoped-for ex-

Eric B. Herzik teaches at Texas A&M University.

Table 1
Higher Education Policy Proposals by Governors: 1976-1985

	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Increased Aid (unspecified)	3	5	4	4	4	4	7	5	5	4
Coordinate/Unify Administration	5	2		1	2	1	2	1	1	2
Planning Report for Future			3		1		2	1		1
Capital Improvements		2	3	2	2			3	2	2
Tuition/Fee Increase	1	1		1	3	1	2	2	2	1
College Loans		5	2	1	2	1			3	4
Support for Minorities	1	2			1		1		1	
Increase Faculty Salaries	2						1	1	2	2
Energy Research			3	2	3					
High-Tech Research							2	14	6	4
Better Links to Business Community		2					2		1	5
Community Colleges	1	1	2					1	1	1
Eliminate Specific Programs						1	1	2		
Total Number of Policy Proposals(a)	13	20	17	12	18	9	20	30	26	27
Number of Governors Sampled	39	43	40	40	40	44	45	39	40	34

Note:

(a) Includes policies not listed in table, e.g., court cases and one-time, idiosyncratic situations.

panded "mission" of the state higher education systems.

These particular concerns and issues may be temporary. For example, following the second energy crisis of 1978-79, there were several governors calling for additional funds for energy research.⁴ The calls for major investment in high technology may follow that energy research trend—declining if not disappearing.

Governors also have one-time-only higher education concerns that demand an immediate policy response. A handful of governors have dealt with college closings, program terminations and faculty layoffs. Three southern state governors developed policies in response to desegregation suits. Divesting stocks of companies dealing with the Republic of South Africa and ethical standards for laboratory animal use are other items of furious, if transitory, concern for governors.

Finally, we must note that there are few calls for additional planning and coordination-unification efforts. However, as funds become scarce with reductions of federal funds in the states, such calls may increase to assist the governors in making the hard decisions they face regarding their higher education systems.

Notes

1. Jean Evangelauf, "Kerr Says Federal Era Has Ended for Colleges: Governors Now the Key," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 3, 1985, 11.

2. Not all governors give state-of-the-state or budget addresses each year. The *State Government News* summary uses the address available for each governor. The number of governors giving addresses for any year analyzed is given in the table.

3. For a further breakdown of content categories, see Bernard Berelson, *Content Analysis in Communication Research* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952) and Klaus Krippendorff, *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1980).

4. For a fuller discussion of the different types of issues governors address, see Eric B. Herzik, "Governors and Issues: A Typology of Concerns," *State Government*, 56, 2 (Summer 1983): 58-64.

State-of-the-State Address
Governor George Nigh, Oklahoma
January 8, 1985

What is our commitment? When we were talking to 3M about coming to Tulsa and I went over there and met with Tulsa leaders and we talked to 3M about coming to Tulsa, 3M looked at me said, "Governor, what can you do for higher education; what can you do for high-tech; what can you do for research?" They said, "In Texas we've talked to the chancellor of the Texas University; he says whatever we want, he'll give us and use his own funds. He's not responsible to the governor; he's not responsible to the regents; he's not responsible to the legislature. He just says, we'll do it." And 3M said, what can you do for us. And I said, "Well, I can ask the legislature to appropriate some money. I can then ask the regents (remember we know that they are constitutional) would they pretty please put it into this special program. Then we'll look at all 27 universities and try to convince the other 26 or the other 24, that we're not really treating them unfairly. We have got to do this and then hopefully we can commit to you some programs." And the guy says, "Is that a commitment?" And they went to Texas.

Governors and Higher Education: Politics, Budgeting and Policy Leadership

By Madeleine Wing Adler and Frederick S. Lane

As demands on the resources of state government increase in number and scope, as the issues become more complex and difficult to solve, as the national government reemphasizes the state role in a federal system in order to reduce the federal budget, the work of the governor becomes less enviable. As students of policy-making who study the climate in which higher education operates, we offer the following theses:

(1) That higher education is primarily a state-level public function.

(2) That higher education is today a separate policy area in the American states.

(3) That increasing size, cost and societal significance have promoted political intervention.

(4) That the governor is viewed as the most important state policy-maker for higher education.

(5) That the governor's authority is promoted by formal powers in the roles of chief executive, chief budget officer and chief opinion leader.

(6) That governors have the potential to assert themselves as leaders in higher education policy-making under certain conditions, if they desire, and that this gubernatorial leadership is strategically important to the quality of higher education.

A Unique Policy Area

To begin with, we see higher education as a policy area of increasing state activity. In the American federal system, we know that most governmental activities are carried out jointly by the various levels of government. At the same time, some policy fields are dominated by state government. Higher education is a good example of an area which is primarily a state responsibility and in which state government is be-

coming increasingly active.

Not only is there a trend toward greater state policy-making activity in higher education, but we also feel that higher education's emergence as a unique policy area is an important related phenomenon. Higher education, as distinct from all of education, or education and welfare, or education and labor, is increasingly developing its own identifiable policy-making system in the American states.

One measure of this would be the degree to which elementary/secondary education and higher education share a single state administrative agency. This is largely not the case: depending on definitions, only three states combine functions in a single unit.

A better indicator of the emergence of a separate policy area is the number of legislatures which have a separate standing committee on higher education in either or both houses. Historically, this has not been the pattern. However, today at least 13 states have a separate committee for higher education in one or both houses of the legislature.

With expanding public higher education, as shown in Table 1, comes the requirement for greatly increased appropriations. The emergence of mass higher education, in both numbers of students and public expenditures, plus student activism beginning in the mid-1960s, increased the costs of visibility for higher education. This trend has brought sustained pressure from political

Madeleine Wing Adler is Visiting University Associate Dean at LaGuardia Community College, the City University of New York. Frederick S. Lane is Professor of Public Administration at Bernard M. Baruch College, the City University of New York.

Table 1
Enrollments in Higher Education
1940, 1960, 1980

Year	Approximate Enrollment	Percent in Public Institutions
1940	1.5 million	53%
1960	3.6 million	58%
1980	12.9 million	78%

Source: National Center for Education Statistics.

leaders for a larger policy role for themselves and greater public accountability by higher educational institutions.

In all this, the state budget has become the most important policy instrument affecting higher education. The experience of institutions of higher education with public funding during the last decade indicates a pattern of increased politicization. In a time of contracting fiscal resources, decision-making authority has shifted from academic leaders to political decision-makers. As a result, educational programs have been increasingly subjected to the demands of the political process.

These changes result at least in part from broader changes in American life. In post-industrial society, knowledge emanating from the university is increasingly important. Society does not sponsor or support institutions that fail to serve its needs. As higher education has been increasingly understood as a useful resource, a problem solver, then intervention has become more frequent.

Trends in Higher Education Policy-making

There are six key trends in state politics and higher education policy-making which help to mark the period under discussion.

First is the increasing internal conflict within the higher education community: public versus private institutions; two-year versus four-year colleges; research universities versus state colleges; faculty unions and associations versus institutional administrators; academic institutions versus statewide coordinating boards; institutions in one part of the state versus institutions in another region. The list seems endless. Higher education's voice, then, is often fragmented and

Table 2
State-level Coordinating Structures for Higher Education
1940, 1960, 1980

	1940	1960	1980
No Board	33	17	1
Voluntary Association	0	6	0
Advisory Coordinating Board	1	5	8
Regulatory Coordinating Board	1	6	19
Consolidated Governing Board	13	16	22
	48	50	50

Note: "Coordinating Boards" are agencies in states where there are also individual institutional governing boards. "Consolidated Governing Boards" are agencies in states in which there are no individual institutional governing boards at public colleges.

Source: Robert O. Berdahl, "Problems in Evaluating Statewide Boards," *New Directions in Institutional Research*, (Spring 1975), 3.

divided. In the absence of consensus, it is often difficult for state officials to know on whom to rely for policy advice.

Second is the rise and assertiveness of statewide coordinating boards. Boards are increasingly pressed to provide centralized planning, budgeting, program review, and policy recommendations—in part to simplify policy-making by the governor and legislature (see Table 2).

Third, fueled by the unemployment and underemployment of graduates, some unhappiness with the skills of college graduates, as well as by the spate of recent reports critical of higher education, higher education has lost a great deal of its earlier luster.¹ Moreover, competition from for-profit proprietary institutions and from industry challenges higher education.

Fourth, policy-makers increasingly tend to involve themselves, not just in the peripheral issues of higher education administration, but in the central program issues, such as new program approval, merger of campuses, and student-faculty ratios.

Fifth, there is a tendency toward overregulation of the campus—limiting its fiscal, personnel and program flexibility. For example, the State University of New York finds that state government, principally the State Division of the Budget (a unit of the Governor's Office) regulates SUNY quite strictly by:

- Allocating funds by position and function.

- Providing, after state budget allocation, little campus expenditure flexibility.
- Providing for elaborate pre-audit of expenditures.
- Controlling expenditure of revenues (considered state income) from diverse sources such as research grants, room and board, fees and auxiliary services.
- Extensive control over ceilings on faculty positions.
- Extensive control on out-of-state travel by university employees.²

SUNY is, of course, an extreme example.

Sixth, there is a return to the emphasis on the economic value of academic institutions—promoting employability of graduates and economic development (“high tech” or otherwise) in the state—regardless of the other goals and accomplishments of colleges and universities.

The Governor's Roles

No single individual is more important to the development of higher education in any state than the governor. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in its 1971 report, *The Capitol and the Campus*, commented: “The potential influence of a governor over public higher education in his state is perhaps greater than any other single force affecting the state’s public colleges and universities.”³

The governor has three main roles in the governance of higher education. These are as the state’s chief executive, chief budget officer, and chief opinion leader.⁴

As chief executive, he may appoint members of state coordinating boards as well as institutional governing boards for public institutions. Also as chief executive, the governor signs or vetoes, encourages or discourages, new legislation affecting higher education, both public and independent. The governor sometimes reviews, and approves or disapproves, statewide master plans for higher education.

As chief budget officer, the governor, assisted by a budget bureau, recommends and approves or disapproves annual budgetary appropriations for all higher education. This role often provides

the governor with considerable influence over the operational decisions of the entire higher education structure.

The traditional model for public budgeting holds that budget requests start in public agencies, then go to the governor and then to the legislature for approval. A more sophisticated understanding reveals state budgeting as a process in which the governor plays the central role:

- First setting the overall tone and indicating to state agencies the parameters for budget requests.
- Then consolidating agency budget requests into the governor’s proposed budget.
- Lobbying the legislature on budget issues.
- Approving or vetoing (including perhaps a line item veto) the legislatively approved budget.
- Implementing and controlling the budget, including possible expenditure ceilings (“caps” and “freezes”).

Because fiscal restraints in the 1980s often force the governor to be an economizer, policy innovation for higher education through the budget is especially difficult.

Since the governor holds office through election by the entire state, the governor is the voice of the people of a state. It is he who provides public opinion leadership in matters relating to higher education. This role of chief opinion leader is particularly important in relations with higher education boards and with a variety of citizen and educational groups and organizations.

In short, the governor’s extensive powers fundamentally affect higher education in each state. The governor is inevitably the single most important policy-maker, especially because of the fiscal role, and particularly in time of change. The governor’s supremacy as policy initiator and budget maker is, in part, due to the ability to draw upon the expertise of the entire executive branch of the government, to the governor’s extensive personal staff, and to the ability to attract media attention and to create an image of authority. Because of these resources, the governor is able to focus the attention of the public on the problems and importance of higher education.

However, there are also new challenges to the governor from the legislature for supremacy in

higher education policy-making. It is important to recognize that although the governor is the most important single actor in the state, he cannot act unilaterally. The role of the legislature in policy initiation and in budget making has been increasing over the last several years in most states.

Gubernatorial Leadership and Higher Education

There was a time in American higher education when the dominant attitude about governance suggested that it took a great president to produce a great university. Later it was the faculty which was seen as most important: a great faculty meant a great institution. Today the focus of power has moved toward external actors, especially the legislature and the governor.

Because of the changing politics and trends affecting higher education policy-making, enlightened gubernatorial leadership may never have been more important than it is today. The great universities of tomorrow may well depend on the vision and determination of state officials. Public institutions especially need this support for success. In an earlier period of relative prosperity and steady demand for entry, some governors chose to become promoters of higher education. With a troubled state economy and fiscal austerity, actual and projected enrollment declines, and formidable demands from other policy areas (criminal justice, elementary/secondary education, human services, economic development, and local assistance), where higher education is concerned the pressure is great on governors to become budget economizers and managers, focusing on effective resource utilization.

In order to understand the potential for gubernatorial leadership in higher education, five factors must be examined:

- (1) The tradition and condition of a state at any given point in time.
- (2) The formal powers of the governor.
- (3) The governor as an individual.
- (4) The governor's ability to build networks with other participants in the policy-making process.
- (5) The governor's ability to set a policy agenda for state government.⁵

Not only are these five factors important, but the alignment or "fit" among the five is critical.

We will now briefly look at each of these five factors.

(1) Almost all theories of leadership stress the importance of the setting in which leadership behavior occurs. Here we mean the social, political and economic condition of a state. Politics is especially important: intra-party competition for governor, competitiveness between the two (or more) political parties, party control of the governor and legislative majorities, legislative professionalism, and citizen interest and participation in policy-making. Here too we are concerned about the state's history and tradition regarding higher education; for example, whether the state came early to public higher education and whether it has traditionally supported higher education well. The state's economic condition combined with the ability and willingness of citizens to pay for state services, including higher education, determine whether sufficient resources are available.

(2) The formal powers of the governor influence his ability to provide leadership in higher education. These include possible limitations on term of office, appointments, budget control, veto power, and organizational strength vis a vis higher education boards and institutions as well as the budget office and other relevant state agencies. The formal powers of governors in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Utah, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota and New York generally have been ranked very strong, while the governorship has been judged weak in Mississippi, Texas, South Carolina, New Hampshire, North Carolina and Nevada.⁶ To this we would add the importance of sufficient gubernatorial staff so that the governor is able to properly execute his duties.

(3) The governor is a person, and personal characteristics are important: background, education, ability, interests, personality. These influence a governor's attitude toward the significance and potential of higher education, as well as his capacity to push the policy system in desired directions.

(4) The governor's performance in mobilizing support—network building—is critical. There are many other policy-making participants, all of whom are potential allies. It is crucial to develop a legislative coalition, especially with members

of the same party, as well as to motivate other policy-relevant groups.

(5) Agenda setting means specifying a relatively short list of goals to accomplish and focusing the attention of policy participants on them. Chief executives who do not set personal agendas, and thereby try to influence the overall agenda for state government, have less impact.

There is no single best style for a governor. What is critical is the alignment of these five factors related directly to gubernatorial performance—in higher education or any other policy area.

There is little question about the limitations of the governor. Despite visibility (especially in a crisis) and staff, governors often have a hard time getting their way. Sometimes, in some states, a governor may be viewed only as a caretaker. More and more, however, governors are expected to be policy entrepreneurs and to lead in the formulation and implementation of public policies and programs.

In order to be an effective leader, a governor must focus on persuasion—from mass publicity to personal persuasion. A governor must attempt to influence other policy-makers based on mutual need and, presumably, mutual advantage.

Colleges and universities quite obviously need to play a central role in policy-making for higher education. They need to understand how the political process works and mobilize to influence that process in appropriate and effective ways. Students, faculty, parents and friends of higher education, as well as administrative leaders, should seek to influence the governor, gubernatorial staff and others who hold public office.

Higher educational institutions should seek to manipulate the structures and procedures that affect their governance. There are plenty of opportunities to do this. For example, in one study of 101 trustees at 12 public colleges in Ohio, 50 percent reported that they had initiated contact with the governor on educational issues, while 36 percent indicated that the governor had initiated contact with them about educational issues.⁷

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, among other groups, have

thoughtfully sought to divide decisions affecting higher education between state government control and institutional autonomy. Regarding financial affairs, for example, the Carnegie Commission suggests that states should appropriate public funds based on general formulas and through post-audit, rather than pre-audit, ensure the effective use of resources. Institutions should have sufficient autonomy, however, to assign funds to specific purposes, make expenditures and personnel actions within budget limitations, and determine faculty and staff assignments and workloads.⁸

Finally, institutions of higher education must persuade the governor and others of the value of higher education, of the efficiency of its operation, of its benefits to the state and nation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, although many political actors can affect the future of higher education, we have illustrated that it is the governor who has the greatest potential to become the initiator as well as the catalyst for policy changes. The governor has the resources derived from his various roles as well as the ability to focus public attention and concern on issues deemed important. However, the governor must also have the will to mobilize these resources to benefit higher education. We argue that the governor should have the will to initiate if for no other reason than the ever-increasing need for a highly educated people in modern society. With the locus of higher education policy-making moving from the campus toward the state capitol, it is incumbent upon the higher education community and its supporters to understand the new politics of higher education and to work harmoniously with the governor so that higher education will become a state priority.

Notes

This is to acknowledge the assistance of William Wright, Anne Marie Pullara and Mireya Bello in connection with this article.

1. Especially see *Integrity in the College Curriculum* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1985); *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, October 1984); *To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984).

2. J. Fredericks Volkwein, "State Financial Control Practices and Public Universities: Results of a National Study," paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March 25, 1984, and *The Challenge and the Choice: Report of the Independent Commission on the Future of the State University* (Albany: State University of New York, January 16, 1985).

3. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *The Capitol and the Campus* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971).

4. *Ibid.*, and Governor's Task Force on Higher Education, *Final Report* (New York: December 1975), 18-20.

5. Based on John Kotter and Paul R. Lawrence, *Mayors*

in Action (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974); Sarah McCally Morehouse, "The Governor as Political Leader," in *Politics in the American States*, 3rd ed., ed. by Herbert Jacob and Kenneth N. Vines (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1976), 196-241; Thad L. Beyle, "Governors," in *Politics in the American States*, 4th ed., ed. by Virginia Gray, Herbert Jacob, and Kenneth N. Vines (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1983), 180-221; Jeffrey Pressman, "Preconditions of Mayoral Leadership," *American Political Science Review*, 66 (June 1972), and Gerald Benjamin, State University of New York College at New Paltz, unpublished manuscripts, 1985.

6. See Beyle, "Governors," 193-203.

7. Joseph B. Tucker, "Politics of Public Higher Education: Ohio," *AAUP Bulletin*, (September 1973), 310-23.

8. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), especially pp. 25-27. Also see *Institutional Rights and Responsibilities* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1971), especially p. 10.

State Coordination and Governance of Higher Education: Implications for Governors

By Aims C. McGuinness Jr.

As the 1985 state legislative sessions began, between eight and 10 states considered reorganization of structures for coordination and governance of higher education. In each of these situations, the governor played a lead role, as the initiator of a special study commission or other means to examine the state's higher education system, or in addressing coordination and governance issues raised by the legislature.

In light of this intensity of activity, several questions are frequently asked. Is there in fact more instability in state structure today in contrast to the past 10 to 15 years? Are there discernible trends or are there contrasts between the current activity and earlier reorganization efforts? Are there any lessons from other states' experiences that governors should consider as they think about reorganization options?

The Record of the 1970s and 1980s

With the exceptions of only a few states, the basic patterns of state-level organization of higher education across the nation today were in place in the early '70s. The year 1972 marked the culmination of more than a decade of development of state higher education agencies formed to coordinate the massive expansion of higher education in the late '50s and '60s. By that year, 47 states had established either consolidated governing boards responsible for all senior institutions (and in some cases, community and junior colleges also) or coordinating boards responsible for statewide planning and coordination of two or more governing boards. Three small states with a limited number of institutions continued to handle statewide higher education issues through the existing governing boards and direct

involvement of the governor and the legislature without a special statewide coordinating or governing agency.

Through the '70s, 12 states made changes in higher education structure that could be characterized as significant: seven states that had previously adopted a coordinating board as opposed to a statewide governing board took steps to strengthen that coordinating function, either modifying the authority of the existing agency or replacing that agency with a new body with increased regulatory authority. Two states replaced their coordinating bodies with statewide governing boards. The other three states made adjustments in their structures that reflected their unique political and structural situations.

In general, the period of the '70s was one of maturation of the coordinating and governing patterns established in the previous decade. It was a period, however, of continued strengthening of the authority of state boards. Of even greater significance, the '70s saw a major increase in the involvement of other executive branch agencies and legislative staffs in higher education affairs, especially in budgetary matters. Increasingly sophisticated legislators, backed by professional staffs, became more directly involved in both the substance and procedures of state higher education policy.

In the early '80s, the pattern of the '70s continued. Major changes occurred in only a few states. Several states (Florida, Minnesota, North Carolina and Tennessee, as examples) reorganized state-level governance of community col-

Aims C. McGuinness Jr. is Assistant Executive Director for the Higher Education Commission of the States.

leges, vocational-technical institutes and related programs. Other states such as Pennsylvania reorganized and consolidated the governance of major higher education sectors. Rhode Island abandoned its single board for all levels of education and established a separate governing board for its three public higher education institutions. The most far-reaching changes occurred in Massachusetts, where a new statewide governing board was established to replace all existing state agencies and boards and in Connecticut, where the idea of a single governing board was rejected and a new and strengthened coordinating board was established.

The Issues Involved

Throughout the past 15 years, the issues motivating changes in coordinating and governing structures have, in part, been related to the social and economic pressures facing higher education and state government as a whole: stabilizing or declining enrollments, severe economic constraints, and other conditions associated with retrenchment. Yet it is remarkable how similar many of the issues have been (and continue to be) despite changes in the overall issues of any particular year. One can trace almost every major reorganization to situations such as these:

- *Actual or potential duplication of high-cost graduate and professional programs.* The issue may arise in a variety of ways: through pressures of a growing urban area to have accessible graduate and professional programs which would duplicate or threaten support for similar programs at the state's major research university (frequently located away from major urban areas), or through successful "end-runs" by institutions to get legislative approval of new programs.
- *Visible conflict between the aspirations of two institutions (often under separate governing boards) located in one geographic area.* Major reorganization proposals (merger, consolidation, etc.) usually occur after years of less dramatic efforts to achieve improved cooperation and coordination.
- *Legislative reaction to intense institutional lobbying.* As the governor and legislature face politically difficult and unattractive choices, increasingly focused on curtailment rather than expansion of programs, intense lobbying by com-

peting institutional interests becomes a major irritant. Reorganization is seen as a way to push the battles away from the immediate political process in the hope that they can be resolved by a newly established or strengthened board. (Ironically, institutional representatives will invariably oppose the reorganization proposals as inappropriate intrusions into institutional autonomy, yet their own behavior in the legislative process may be the underlying motivation for the changes.)

- *A sense that the existing higher education structure has been ineffective in addressing the issues for which it was established.* Most statewide coordinating and governing boards, as they carry out their responsibilities in no man's land between state government and the institutions, will face proposals for their elimination in just about every legislative session; few of these advance beyond the bill stage. In states where serious reorganization proposals are made, political leaders frequently express opinions that the existing board (or its staff) is providing ineffective leadership or that it lacks the political influence and judgment to deal with critical issues facing the state. "Critical issues" may be defined as long-standing conflicts such as mentioned above. Far more than the formal authority of a board, the factors that most frequently define board effectiveness are the prestige and quality of board members; the ability of the board to function as a cohesive group rather than as a collection of individual interests; and the reputation of the board staff among both political and institutional leaders for its objectivity, fairness, sound judgment and commitment to conflict resolution. Reorganization is proposed not simply because the formal authority of the previous structure was insufficient but because of a desire to change the leadership and personalities involved in the process.

In addition to these consistent themes, one other is heard with increasing frequency: that limited public resources are being spread over too many institutions with too little attention being given to quality and unique missions. Assertions are made that the current state system is failing to differentiate among institutions and programs according to quality and state priorities.

The State of the States: 1985

Given these changes over the past 15 years, what is the status of state structure for higher education in early 1985? Table 1 lists the states according to the extent of the authority of the principal higher education board or agency. Moving from left to right, the states with the most comprehensive statewide governing boards are listed on the left, whereas the states with coordinating boards or state agencies with only limited planning authority are listed toward the right. The extent of a state agency's authority to approve academic programs, followed by the board's role in the budgetary process are used to place states in different columns.

In several respects, Table 1 ignores subtle yet important differences among states. Attempts to transpose one state's structure to another frequently do not consider points such as these:

- *Different roles of the legislative and executive branches of state government.* In some states, the legislature plays the dominant role and effective relations with that branch of government are essential to the success of the coordinating or governing mechanism. In other states, the governor is the key figure.

- *Different traditions regarding the state role in relation to institutions.* In some states, the government has traditionally treated all public institutions as state-owned and regulated agencies. The institutions are subject to the same procedural controls applicable to other state agencies. In other states, institutions are treated as state-assisted, privately-controlled entities and are exempt from most state procedural controls. In still other states, the pattern is mixed.

- *Different sub-board structures.* By looking only at the authority of a single board, one misses the variations in sub-board structure. Some states with consolidated governing boards have advisory or managing boards for each institution or campus. States with coordinating boards vary from those with governing boards for each public institution, to those with all institutions under two or more governing boards or multi-campus university systems, to those with a mixed pattern of institutional governance.

- *Intangible, subtle differences in tradition and quality of leadership.* What makes all classification difficult is that perhaps the most important

distinguishing features of any state's higher education system relate to matters of tradition and leadership. While traditions may endure, the leadership capabilities of board members, the staffs of statewide agencies, and the chief executive officers of institutions change. A board that is recognized as strong and effective at one point may be seen as weak and ineffective at another, primarily because of changes in the composition of the board and behavior of board members. To the extent that a governor has authority to make board appointments, this may be one of his or her strongest means for influencing the quality of the state's higher education system.

A frequently asked question is this: has there been any discernible trend toward single statewide consolidated governing boards such as were adopted in North Carolina and Wisconsin in the early '70s and in Massachusetts in 1980? In most of the states that have undergone major reorganization in recent years, the option of a single governing board has been considered along with a variety of other options. What may be most significant is that in the 15 or more states where this option has been considered in the past 10 years, it has been adopted in only one. In all others, the choice has been to retain but strengthen an existing coordinating mechanism while maintaining a separate system of institutional governance.

The reorganization proposals currently being considered stem from and reflect most of the issues and controversies of the governance debates of the past 10 to 15 years. Yet there are several new themes that should be noted. Perhaps the most important is the renewed recognition by governors and legislators of the central role that the state's higher education system plays in the state's economic future: in the ability to attract new industry (especially high-technology companies) and in the state's overall social, economic and cultural well-being. This is fueling a new sense of urgency regarding the effectiveness and responsiveness of the state's systems for governing and financing higher education. It is not uncommon to hear a governor or state legislator remark, "We can't hope to compete with other states for new industry and jobs if we keep spreading our limited state resources across too many mediocre institutions, and we can't get our

Table 1
Authority of State Boards of Higher Education

Consolidated Governing Boards		Coordinating Boards					Planning Agencies	
Board for All Public Institutions	Board for All Senior Institutions—Separate Agency for Community Colleges	With Program Approval Authority			With Program Review and Recommendation Authority Only			
		Consolidated or Aggregated Budget	Budget Review and Recommendation	No Statutory Budget Role	Consolidated or Aggregated Budget	Budget Review and Recommendation	No Statutory Budget Role or Program Approval	
Ga.	Ariz.	Ala.	Colo.	N.Y.(a)	Ark.	Alaska(b)	N.H.(b)	Del.
Hawaii	Iowa	Conn.	Ind.			Ore.(b)	Neb.	Vt.
Idaho(a)	Kan.	Ill.	Ky.			Calif.		
Mass.	Miss.	N.J.	La.			Minn.		
Mont.(a)	N.C.	Ohio	Mo.(a)			Wash.		
Nev.	Fla.(a)	Okla.	N.M.			Mich.(a)		
N.D.	Ore.	S.C.	Tenn.					
R.I.	Wyo.	Md.	Texas					
Utah			Pa.(a)					
W.Va.			Va.					
Wis.								
Alaska								
Maine								
S.D.								

Notes:

(a) States with agency responsible for all levels of education.

(b) Separate statutory coordinating agency.

Source: Education Commission of the States (1983).

act together amid the intense bickering among various institutional interests." Or, "I'd be willing to put much more money into higher education if only I had confidence that the priorities were more clearly defined, the missions of institutions more sharply focused, and confidence that the existing coordinating structure was making tough choices among competing options."

In the majority of states, many policy options other than reorganization are being explored or implemented to improve the quality of higher education. Nevertheless, in those states where reorganization is a strong possibility, a motivating force is a sense among the political leaders that what the state needs is a strategic vision of the role that higher education can play in the state's future and new leadership with the authority and prestige to carry out that vision. More effective governance is seen as an essential prerequisite to obtaining that leadership.

The state initiatives for economic development, technology and quality improvement all reflect a tendency toward centrally-directed higher edu-

cation policies. A countervailing tendency in the current debates about higher education governance is an interest in deregulation and decentralization. Options either already adopted by some states or under consideration by others include the following:

- *Increasing recognition of importance of institutional governing boards.* Actions include: efforts to improve the quality of gubernatorial appointments to governing boards; encouraging greater participation of board members in training programs; and increased delegation to boards of management responsibilities previously controlled by one or more state agencies.

- *Increasing financial management flexibility for institutions.* The most extensive changes involve a significant reduction in the number of line items in the state budget and delegation of extensive authority to institutions for shifting of funds among programs and accounts, for carry-over of funds at the end of the fiscal year, and for retaining and investing institutional revenues. In other states, detailed procedural controls

in areas such as purchasing and personnel previously handled by executive branch agencies have been delegated to institutions.

These and other changes reflect a growing awareness of the limitations of traditional state fiscal and regulatory controls and an interest in exploring new policy tools aimed at stimulating effective decentralized management and a creative, "bottom-up" renewal within higher education. As reorganization proposals are considered in 1985, one might expect to see deliberate attempts to balance two approaches. On the one hand, centralized improvements will be made in strategic planning and resolution of major policy coordination issues. On the other hand, institutional renewal will be promoted through decentralized management and increased use of incentives rather than traditional policy directives and regulations.

The Goals of Future Reorganization

As underscored by the number of states contemplating higher education reorganization in 1985, this is likely to be a serious issue for governors not only this year but in years to come. Before proposing a major change in governance, certain premises should be considered:

- *Organizational structure and reorganization should be seen as means rather than ends in themselves.* More than a few states have embarked on reorganization without a deliberate effort to identify and clarify the real issues facing the state. Other options may be more appropriate.

- *States should examine the total higher education policy process, not just the formal higher education structure.* In a number of states, the focus has been on the authority and functions of

single agencies or groups of state-level boards without thorough consideration of the roles played by the governor, legislature and executive and legislative branch staffs. Also important are the formal and informal relationships that make up the state higher education policy process. It is not uncommon for a state to attempt to adopt another state's structure without considering these other points.

- *There is no perfect system, no preferred model.* State coordination of higher education is perhaps the most complex balancing act in state government. Conflicting interests are the reality. State interests are not the same as institutional interests, and despite assertions to the contrary, state interests are not simply the sum of the interests of all the institutions in the state. An effective structure is one that draws these conflicting interests together in a way that differences and tensions are resolved before they erupt into major political controversies.

Most governors can take at least two actions short of advancing a major restructuring of governance that will contribute to the future quality of their state's higher education system: first, they can speak out and build public understanding of how a first-rate, well-managed and diverse higher education system can contribute to the state's social, cultural and economic well-being. And second, to the extent that they have authority to appoint members of statewide or institutional boards, governors can seek out widely respected leaders with a sincere interest in higher education to serve on those boards. The difference among those states with and those without outstanding systems are less differences in governance structure than in vision and the commitment of leadership to achieve that vision.

References

- Citizens Committee for the Study of Higher Education in Nebraska. *Toward the 21st Century*. Report to the Governor. Lincoln, Nebraska: December 1984.
- Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership. *Presidents Make a Difference: Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1984.
- Education Commission of the States. *Catalog of Changes: Incentives for Quality and Management Flexibility in Higher Education*. Denver: ECS, January 1985.
- _____. Survey and Profiles of State Coordination and Governance of Higher Education. Denver: ECS, February 1985.
- Glenny, Lyman A., and Bowen, Frank M. *Toward a New Beginning: Balancing Local Control with State Coordination and Governance*. Report on higher education governance and coordination prepared for the Temporary Committee on Education Policy, Structure and Management of the State of Washington. Olympia, Washington: August 31, 1984.
- Governor's Commission on the Future of Higher Education in Michigan. *Putting Our Minds Together: New Directions for Michigan Higher Education*. Final Report. Lansing, Michigan: December 1984.
- Higher Education Committee, Report to the Colorado General Assembly, January 1985.
- McGuinness, Aims C. Jr., "State Governance of Higher Education." *State Education Governance: 1983*. Denver: ECS, 1983.
- Millett, John D. *Conflict in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

Alternative Funding Strategies for Higher Education

By Gordon K. Davies and Eric M. Engler

The major point of this article is that governors should work within their states to create political acceptance of alternative funding strategies for higher education and bureaucratic competence to implement these strategies. The problems of accumulated equipment deficiencies and aging physical plants cannot be solved with general fund tax dollars and tuition and fees alone. The needs are too great, and the traditional sources of funding too limited.

Funding Higher Education

The funding pattern of state-supported higher education has changed gradually over the past two decades, and is changing now at an accelerated rate. Support from federal, state and local governments has been eroded as other social programs compete for the limited funds available. The federal government has considerably narrowed its conception of its responsibility to support higher education, and proposals to reduce funding even further can be expected. At the same time, state and local governments are focusing their attention upon public schools, health and mental health, corrections and other priorities.

In response to this pattern of decreased support, colleges and universities have taken three general kinds of action: they have increased tuition and fees, reduced expenditures, and made major efforts to raise private funds.

It has been argued that student fee increases either have already or are now beginning to limit access to higher education. Further increases in this source of institutional funding will be limited as competition for a declining number of high school graduates during the next decade becomes more acute.

Reductions in expenditures have been a way of life during the past several years at many universities and colleges. The expenditures cut most severely have been those for equipment and plant maintenance. The purchase of new, state-of-the-art equipment, books and other materials has been either deferred or greatly reduced, and equipment replacement programs have been set aside. Needed maintenance and facility updating also have been the targets of severe cuts, at a time of accumulated and urgent needs for energy efficiency, systems upgrading (including telecommunications and computers), facility accessibility, and asbestos removal.

Special Equipment Problems

Particularly hard hit by this financial situation have been equipment purchases. There are several reasons for this:

(1) Education institutions generally do not depreciate capital investments. The first major cycle of post-World War II building replacement must be undertaken without adequate reserve accounts.

(2) The costs of replacing basic systems (such as telecommunications, power plant, air conditioning and steam lines) and original equipment (such as laboratories and lecture hall seating) are not currently in the operating budget base.

(3) Faced with the need to cut operating budgets, institutions almost always have chosen to protect their human resources, faculty and staff, even at the expense of their equipment inventories.

Gordon K. Davies is Director and Eric M. Engler is Assistant Director of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

(4) Resources have been diverted from scheduled maintenance and equipment acquisition and replacement to pay for unavoidable operating costs and the cumulative effects of inflation.

(5) Demand for adequate equipment has broadened to more disciplines as new applications are found for increasingly powerful equipment (including computer hardware and software), improving the curriculum, and introducing new educational and administrative methods.

(6) Public institutions have typically been subject to personnel management controls, often imposed from outside the institution. Equipment requirements have intensified as institutional workload has been transferred from employees to owned or leased equipment, with attendant increases in expenses for consumable supplies, service contracts and other non-personal service expenditures.

(7) The accelerating rate of obsolescence requires more rapid acquisition, disposition, and financing procedures in order to develop and maintain the currency of the inventory. Inability to respond to these needs has an "opportunity cost" reflected in the national rankings of academic and research efforts.

(8) The fixed asset requirements of an institution do not neatly correspond to either the operating or capital budgets. The use of either budget may be appropriate, depending upon the useful life of the asset. The original equipment and furnishings for a laboratory may be financed as a capital cost and replaced as an operating cost. In state budget systems, maintenance of the moveable equipment inventory may end up as the lowest priority in both the operating and capital budgets.

(9) Planning to replace fixed assets systematically is especially difficult because of the unpredictability of support for higher education:

- Stable enrollments remove the political urgency for increased appropriations.
- Research sponsorship varies widely over time and is unevenly distributed among institutions.
- Public funds may be appropriated at far below needed levels and then reduced or frozen on short notice.
- Federal capitation funding supported the expansion of expensive professional programs, but

the state must support the programs now that the capitation funding has expired.

Virginia as a Case in Point

The Virginia Council on Higher Education, which coordinates the 10th largest system of public colleges and universities in the nation, surveyed the moveable equipment inventories of the institutions in 1984. The inventory had an estimated value of about \$600 million, of which \$300 million was educational equipment in classrooms, laboratories, libraries and so on.

Of the \$300 million, almost one-third, or \$100 million, of educational equipment was obsolete. In addition, the Council determined, in consultation with the institutions, that the inventory was deficient by at least \$100 million in equipment: \$30 million in engineering, \$40 million in instructional computing, \$20-30 million in occupational-technical programs, plus language laboratories and other equipment.

The pool of educational equipment becomes obsolete at an average rate of seven years per unit. This means that one-seventh, or about \$40 million worth, of the inventory should be replaced each year in order to avoid the problem of accumulated obsolescence which plagues us today.

Putting these numbers together, Virginia's public colleges and universities can show a need for \$200 million to replace obsolete equipment and acquire equipment they never had, and a need for at least \$40 million each year to maintain their inventories of educational equipment. To say that the needs are great is an understatement. To say that the state's general fund and student tuition cannot meet the needs is realistic. We need to develop alternative sources of funding for higher education equipment, simply in order to prepare students adequately to function in a technologically advanced society.

Options

Several methods of raising funds for equipment acquisition beyond the normal capacity of annual budgets have been used by public and private institutions of higher education. Generally, each method extends payment over the useful life of the assets, offers an economic advantage to the provider of the funds, or uses existing tax laws

and the exempt status of the non-profit institutions to reduce the cost of debt.

Issuance of Debt Instruments. A 1984 publication by J.D. Millet cites dedication of student academic fees for debt service in 10 of the 25 states surveyed. The legislative bodies in some states are committed through prior agreement with the governing or coordinating board to replace the dedicated revenues with general fund appropriations. Capitalized expense undertaken without prior legislative approval does not have a legislative commitment for revenue replacement.

The applicability of long-term debt (more than 10 years) generally is limited to pieces of equipment, operating and mechanical systems, repairs, renovations and rehabilitations that are estimated to have a useful life of 10 years or longer. Under certain circumstances, however, long-term debt can be incurred and managed so as to finance several acquisitions of equipment with a useful life shorter than that of the debt instrument.

Equipment purchases also can be financed by short-term (one to 10 years), tax-exempt notes or bonds. Under this option, costs would be spread more representatively over a greater number of annual budgets and students and faculty benefiting from the acquisition. The major advantage to the institution or issuing authority acting on behalf of many institutions is the ability to plan and expeditiously issue no more debt than necessary at any time, thus avoiding excessive borrowing costs.

Contributions of Equipment. The 1981 Economic Recovery Act provides an increased incentive for manufacturers to donate certain kinds of scientific equipment for research or research training. These provisions offer greater tax advantages than the standard charitable deductions which still apply for non-scientific equipment, other institutional uses, and other donors. Many institutions already have benefited from major donations of data processing equipment conforming to the tax law provisions.

Research Effort. Private enterprises may earn tax credit for certain incremental scientific research expenditures qualifying under the 1981 tax law amendments. The scientific research may be either basic or applied, provided that the re-

search contract meets all the qualifying criteria and the expenses are incurred before the expiration of the amendment (January 1, 1986). This may be a more attractive option than equipment contributions, depending upon the projected liquidity of the corporation, and expands the list of potential benefactors beyond hardware manufacturers. Modification, extension or deletion of these provisions of the tax law will affect decisions to invest in research conducted within higher education.

Sale-Leaseback. This option, sometimes referred to as "privatization," concentrates on the transfer of a depreciating asset (such as a hospital) to private ownership. The private enterprise purchases the asset, takes the applicable investment tax credit and depreciation allowances, and the institution continues to use the asset (a building or equipment) at a reasonable lease price while having the added advantage of the cash from the sale. State law would determine whether the cash could remain with the institution, be channeled through a special authority, or accrue to the general fund. The recent popularity of this financing method has brought close scrutiny by the Internal Revenue Service. Congress is likely to restrict the future use of this technique in an effort to reduce abuses.

Participation in sale-leaseback agreements is reasonable for large institutions, but it is difficult or prohibitively expensive for small institutions to be assured that their best interests are protected by the partnerships.

Collective Efforts. Some of the equipment acquisition options have the potential to generate large amounts of cash for very short periods of time. This becomes especially important if any of the options are to be collectively undertaken by several institutions. Pooled efforts would reduce the overhead cost of issuing debt, would avoid the difficulty of marketing relatively small issues, and would offer research, manufacturing and investment companies a broader range of institutional partnership possibilities. This would allow smaller institutions to participate because it would have the effect of virtually eliminating the origination cost of the debt instrument (bond counsel, banking, insurance, rating).

One of the most important advantages of collective efforts to acquire equipment financing is the

opportunity to reinvest large cash balances for the period prior to actual payment for delivered equipment or payment of debt service. The proceeds of daily cash management can be used to reduce the size of the loan or to acquire more equipment, or can accrue to the managing state authority for reinvestment until the next acquisition project is arranged. There are limitations on the arbitrage rate and period of investment of bond sale proceeds, but the advantage is not outweighed by these restrictions. The combination of earnings and equity from donated funds and equipment could, over a period of time, lead to a self-sustaining fund for higher education equipment acquisition.

The five options described above require a thorough understanding of state law to determine how public institutions can gain access to private funds and what legal or administrative revisions may be necessary or desirable. Participation by private colleges and universities does not appear to create any technical problems, provided that reinvestments, debt service and expenses are properly documented and allocated by an accounting system among the public and private participants.

The options for support of major educational equipment acquisitions can be exercised simultaneously to meet specific institutional needs. Exercise of certain options can be handled most efficiently by a small central service agency or authority. Creation of a separate debt-issuing authority, perhaps within the state higher education agency, offers the opportunity to establish a continuous flow of education equipment funding at low cost. To ensure accountability, the debt issues of the authority should be subject to approval by the state higher education agency, which would certify that the equipment is needed by the participating institutions. It is essential that the equipment lists assembled by the state higher education agency represent the acquisitions most important to the institutions and most likely to have an immediate effect upon faculty and student performance and academic excellence.

The Governor's Role

The alternatives identified in this article, especially those which would use debt to finance equipment acquisition, may come in for criticism because colleges and universities have rarely been supported in these ways in the past. This is where the governor's support is crucial.

First of all, only the governor can open state government to alternative approaches to finance. It seems clear, looking at Virginia and at other states, that we will not finance higher education adequately in the future from tax revenues and tuition and fees. We must find other sources of support, and the governor has to build within state agencies capacities that probably do not exist today. Most attorneys general have no staff to serve either formally or informally as bond counsel as states plan these sorts of activity. They have little capacity to advise colleges and universities about implications of tax law at the federal or state level. Most state treasurers have little capacity to deal with short-term, variable-rate debt because most of the debt states incur is long-term and fixed-rate.

Second, the governor can assure the business community and the general public that these are, indeed, fiscally prudent and responsible ways to finance higher education. He or she can say that the most fiscally responsible thing to do with the state's dollars is not to put them in a mattress but to invest them and to issue debt prudently so that the state does, in fact, pay for equipment as its useful life is consumed.

Third, the governor should establish controls to be sure that the equipment that is purchased is needed and to assure that the debt that is issued is indeed justified by the needs of higher education and not by the demands of the financial institutions that profit by issuing it.

The governor can ensure that state government is open to alternative approaches to financing higher education and can create within executive agencies the expertness to support these kinds of endeavors. He or she can assure the general public and the business community that this is a fiscally responsible way in which to use state revenues and maintain a system of higher education, and can establish proper controls over these

alternative funding mechanisms. In doing these things, the governor will help colleges and universities prepare for their future and will estab-

lish a strong, healthy relationship with higher education.

Dimension of Leadership in Higher Education

By Stanley O. Ikenberry

In almost any book, article or speech on the problems in higher education, there is a call for stronger leadership in higher education. This is a particularly important aspect in the relations between the governor's office and our university and college systems and programs. Frequently missing from these discussions, however, is a conceptualization of leadership tangible enough to explain the implications for university presidents as well as governors.

I will suggest at least three possible dimensions of leadership that have significance for the relationship between the office of the governor and universities, and then suggest some implications that may follow.

Articulation of a System of Values and Beliefs

One of the principal areas of leadership breakdown in our society, particularly at the level of discussion between the office of the governor and higher education officials, is the creation of a shared system of values and beliefs accepted by the governor and the higher education community. I refer here to a common understanding of what is believed about higher education in a particular state that will provide a rational foundation for actions and policy decisions. As one tries to understand the agenda, weigh priorities and gain a common view of what's trying to be done, all of this ultimately is grounded not only in fiscal reality and structure, but more fundamentally in what one believes and what one values.

Traditions and aspirations are important in this context as they help sustain and articulate values and beliefs. To the extent they are understood by a governor, past accomplishments and hopes for the future for higher education provide a framework for how a governor thinks and be-

haves and how a university president functions. They provide a rationale for how a higher education system behaves within the context of the state. So my first argument is: one of the burdens of leadership for the governor, and certainly a leadership responsibility for university presidents, is to articulate a system of values and beliefs essential to build this common base of understanding necessary to link decisions and actions in higher education to more basic value or belief systems.

Integration of Higher Education within the Larger Environment

A second crucial dimension of leadership is to help complex organizations come to terms with the larger environment in which they function. Presidents must visualize the university functioning within a much larger social context—state, regional, national—and governors must conceptualize a state's system of higher education within the broader goals of the state. The obvious essential is to comprehend that larger environment and detect how it is changing. Leadership also is the capacity to look internally—whether within the context of a state or a university system—and facilitate the new directions necessary to adapt to changes occurring in the larger environment.

One presumes the university president knows what is going on inside the university or that the head of a system understands what is happening at various campuses; that the executive director of a higher education coordinating board understands what is actually going on; that governors know what's happening in higher education,

Stanley O. Ikenberry is President of the University of Illinois.

highways, economic development and the other sectors of concern. The fact is, in nearly every instance the presumption falls far short of reality. Involvement, "getting down on the shop floor," bridging the communication gaps—these and other initiatives to build the knowledge base are essential elements of leadership.

The failure of leadership in higher education frequently stems from a lack of knowledge on the part of the governor, governing boards, presidents and others.

To return to the question of a changing environment, let me illustrate by noting the changing focus on economic development in many if not most of our states. The focus is on job creation and long-range economic growth prospects. This concern is part of the larger environment of universities as well. The rate of job creation in Chicago, for example, has lagged behind the national average for the last 30 years. Yet only in the last year or two have the citizens of Chicago—corporate and civic leaders, the mayor, governor and others—really become conscious of what's been happening over the last quarter of a century. Work has begun to try to address the issue.

Similar examples can be cited in nearly every state and region. The fire in the belly leading the public toward reforms in elementary and secondary education is fueled by concerns for the health of the economy. Higher standards, more emphasis on foreign language competence, renewed attention to science and mathematics offerings, higher and more clearly articulated admission standards in the universities and colleges—these concerns tend to flow from a concern for the competitiveness of the human resource base of the state or region. These and related reforms seek to improve quality in education and grow out of a genuine fear and concern for the nation's long-term economic health.

There is another dimension to the integration process. In trying to bring a university into harmony with the environment in which it functions, one obvious requirement of leadership is to help the university work in constructive ways to change the environment itself, or, in other words, to alter the environment to bring it in harmony with the university. Presidents frequently complain about the lack of understanding and support for universities, yet part of academic

leadership is to foster such support and understanding. As academic leaders we can be more aggressive and imaginative to alter the environment of public opinion in which we function.

So articulation of belief systems and the bonding, if you will, of belief systems with actions and decisions will help promote the integration—the harmony—of complex universities and the larger environment in which they function.

The Creative Use of Power

A third dimension of leadership is the exercise of power. One hopes power is exercised responsively, constructively, compassionately and imaginatively, but regardless, leaders must exercise power.

There are, however, other power-related functions of leadership not often discussed: the capacity to create power and the willingness to disperse power—give it away.

Let me comment briefly on creation of power. Power is elastic. It can grow and contract. Power can be nurtured and expanded. If a governor, for example, understands higher education, if there are shared beliefs about where higher education ought to be going and about the larger agenda of the state, there can be a collaboration among the higher education community, the governor's office, the media, and the public that enhances power—the capacity to act—on the part of all.

Strong leadership in a governor's office, for example, obviously can enhance or undermine the power of those on campuses. Active alumni can enhance the power of a governor to build a base of understanding and communication in the state. Informed leadership translates into more effective, powerful leadership.

Power also can be dispersed. One of the issues of considerable concern in higher education in the states relates to the system-campus relationship—how chancellors relate to presidents and how chancellors and presidents relate to governors. One of the leadership functions of a president within the context of the state's higher education system is to disperse power in constructive, creative ways—to chancellors, deans and others to enable them to perform their jobs more effectively. Too frequently, one hears of discussion to the contrary: struggles by coordinating

boards, presidents, chancellors, each attempting to retain power. A healthy system operating in the context of healthy leadership should have the capacity to dispense power rather than struggle over it.

Relating to the Governor

Within such a framework of leadership—articulation of a system of values and beliefs, integrating with the larger environment, and the creative use of power—let us turn more directly to the relationship between higher education and governors.

The most fundamental admonition is for those of us in higher education to *talk* to the governors. What a simple-minded admonition, yet years go by in many states in the absence of truly useful conversations between the governor and the top-level management in universities. The lack of communication, however, was more a product of earlier days and different times. One senses governors and the higher education community now see relationships in new terms and that conversation is increasing. But the fact remains, there is no substitute in the case of public universities for effective communication between the higher education community and the governor.

I remember from earlier days with horror how administrators at one public university I knew well used to turn on the radio and listen to the governor's budget message to learn what was to be recommended for higher education. What a breakdown in communication! No university president should have to read a newspaper or listen to the radio to find out what the governor is thinking or what he proposed for higher education.

The governor is the key person who must carry the concern for the total, general welfare of the people. In this context, there must be a sufficient level of communication between higher education and the governor to permit a sharing of hopes and dreams, and an understanding of constraints and realities. There must be a shared view of reality, a common set of expectations as to what might be done.

Those of us in higher education need to work harder to try to see the world through the governor's eyes. It is a different world than our own—a

much more complex world. Just as we urge governors to try to understand, we need to try to look beyond the campus to see the complexity of the world that confronts the governor—to try to understand the broader agenda for the state over the long term.

There is a major caveat: Clark Kerr is right when he sees danger in excessive concentration of power and too much dependence by universities on any one person, including the governor. In many states, the governor is incredibly powerful. In Illinois, the governor has the power of the purse, to propose the budget; the ability to lobby the proposal through the legislature; the authority to line item veto, language as well as dollars; and more times than not, the governor can work his will. Other states are comparable. Is it any wonder that higher education feels from time to time excessively dependent on one human being? On the other hand, the absence of a strong executive branch may bring even more hazards. A sense of balance, obviously, is the ideal.

One special public policy challenge for those in higher education is to work to bring different priorities and programs into harmony—those for the state as a whole with those of the university. One of the challenges of the role of president of a university is to interpret to those inside the university this larger system of priorities, the limits and boundaries, and achieve a consensus about logical integration of a larger plan.

Important to governors and to those in higher education is the conscientious building of a tradition of good process. Someone once observed that one of the principal responsibilities of a governor is to build and sustain the structural capability of a state to solve problems, and this ties directly to the issue of process. The distinction between intrusion by a governor and insightful, visionary leadership may rest not so much on the substance of the governor's proposal as on the process through which the governor exercises the initiative.

Timing is fundamental to good process. Those of us in higher education frequently function behind the curve where there is very little opportunity for influence.

Governors have a unique capacity to serve as spokesmen, to play the role of the great communicator, as it were, and to create and maintain a

support network. But leaders in higher education also can shape public opinion more aggressively and thoughtfully than we do. Presidents can build networks, too. To speak to a large, complex, diverse world that gains most of its information from the electronic and print media is one of the leadership responsibilities those in higher education must carry.

Finally, there is a human dimension. University presidents must treat governors as human beings that, like the presidents themselves, have egos, emotion, fatigue, etc. Too frequently we ask for help rather than offer it. We ask to be listened to, rather than listen. Occasionally, governors would like some acknowledgment of help when they stick their necks out or place themselves at risk on behalf of higher education. If there is to be a partnership, we should recognize the human dimension of the relationship between the governor and higher education.

In it all, university presidents can be teachers. What a governor believes about higher education is what he learns. Most of what a governor learns and believes about higher education may be drawn from his personal experience in going to college or the experience of his children. What

he understands may come from other individuals or from TV and newspapers. There is an opportunity to create a dialogue—a constructive learning session—between higher education and the governor to help governors build an educational ideology and an educational agenda.

The agenda won't be dictated by a university president, but there is a need to explain the options, explore the implications, and build a philosophical framework that places the governor in a position to take a thoughtful long-range view about the place of higher education in the state and nation.

The opportunity for governors and those in higher education to work together is greater today than in the last two decades. A state's educational system—elementary, secondary and higher education—is the single most important asset it has as the state faces the future and increases its problem-solving capacity, quality of life and long-range economic development. Therefore, the ability to work together in a collaborative relationship is imperative. I believe the responsibility and initiative for building that collaborative relationship rests primarily with the higher education community.



The Council of State Governments is a joint agency of all state governments—created, supported, and directed by them. It conducts research on state programs and problems; maintains an information service available to state officials and legislators; issues a variety of publications; assists in state-federal liaison; promotes regional and state-local cooperation; and provides staff for affiliated organizations.

Chairman:

Sen. James I. Gibson, Nevada

President:

Gov. Charles S. Robb, Virginia

Vice Chairman:

Rep. John E. Miller, Arkansas

Vice President:

Gov. Robert D. Orr, Indiana

Council Offices

Carl W. Stenberg, Executive Director

Headquarters: P.O. Box 11910,
Iron Works Pike, Lexington, KY 40578
(606) 252-2291

Darrell Perry, Director,
Finance and Administration

Doug Roederer, Director,
Research and State Services

Eastern: Alan V. Sokolow, Director
1500 Broadway, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10036, (212) 221-3630

Midwestern: Virginia Thrall, Director
203 North Wabash Ave.
Chicago, IL 60601, (312) 236-4011

Southern: Tom E. Richter, Director
3384 Peachtree Rd. N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30326, (404) 266-1271

Western: Daniel M. Sprague, Director
720 Sacramento St.
San Francisco, CA 94108, (415) 986-3760

Washington: Norman Beckman, Director
Hall of the States, 444 N. Capitol St.
Washington, DC 20001, (202) 624-5450

3

Ms. Nancy Stewart
Acquisitions Librarian
ERIC
4833 Rugby Ave., Suite 301
Bethesda, MD 20814